

VISION  
IN  
TELEVISION



"Words fail me —"

With love to Herb

Agnes Cooley Spiller  
Mrs. Jesse Spiller  
(AUTHOR)

May 21, 1956








VISION  
IN  
TELEVISION

*The Origins and Potentialities  
of Educational Television*




# VISION IN TELEVISION

*The Origins and Potentialities  
of Educational Television*



HAZEL COOLEY



CHANNEL PRESS, PUBLISHERS  
1440 BROADWAY NEW YORK 18, N.Y.

Copyright, 1952, by Channel Press

All rights reserved including the right to reproduce  
this book or parts thereof in any form

CHANNEL PRESS

New York

Printed in the U.S.A.

*To*  
*My Country -*  
*Land that I Love.*

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to acknowledge permission which the publishers of University of Chicago Press, Harcourt Brace & Company, Inc., Life Magazine, New York Times Magazine, New York Times Sunday Department, Readers Digest, Saturday Review of Literature, Variety, and Leo Cherne, Jack Gould, and A. Whitney Griswold, have given her to quote excerpts which appear herein.

## PREFACE

Last year I undertook a research job on the importance of television to education. This book is the result. I have attempted to point out the invaluable contributions which the commercial system has made to the development of radio and TV. And I have attempted to indicate that the influence of TV on our national well-being can be enormously heightened by the development of a supplementary non-commercial system of television.

My chief purpose has been to create a better awareness of the vital role of TV as a principal factor in determining the attitudes and behavior of contemporary society. The allocation of educational channels constitutes a landmark in the progress of American education. In this book, I have tried to tell how this landmark came to be and what its potentialities are.

The assistance of the Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C., and of the Joint Committee on Educational Television, also of Washington, D.C., is available to those who desire advice in the development of educational television.

I wish to express my indebtedness to Professor Emil Greenberg who has had considerable influence on this book. His thinking is a happy augury for the future of television.

H.C.

New York City  
September 5, 1952



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	The Background of Broadcasting .....	1
II.	The Need For A Supplementary System .....	13
III.	A Philosophy of Education for TV .....	25
IV.	The Individual, The Community, and the Nation .....	36
V.	Through a Glass, Darkly .....	46
Appendix A.	The Dissent of Commissioner Frieda B. Hennock from the Federal Communications Commission's Sixth Report and Order. ....	53
Appendix B.	Estimated Costs of Construction and Operation of Television Stations Proposed by Board of Regents of the University of the State of New York. ....	72
Appendix C.	The Low State of TV. Television is Trading Future Greatness for Synthetic Popularity Ratings, by Jack Gould. ....	77



VISION  
IN  
TELEVISION

*The Origins and Potentialities  
of Educational Television*



## CHAPTER I

### THE BACKGROUND OF BROADCASTING

Radio broadcasting began in this country in 1920, with the announcement of presidential returns over Station KDKA, in Pittsburgh. There could not have been many listeners to the first broadcast because of the scarcity of sets at that time. But the idea caught on and the public responded amazingly. It became a national craze to “dabble” in radio; broadcasting for would-be listeners and would-be broadcasters opened a literal “free for all”. Imagine the thrill of plucking voices, music, sound right out of the air! By 1927, the chaos that existed in the air, because of the enthusiasm of radio pioneers, was so intense that — at the request of the industry itself — Congress at last took cognizance of the situation and passed the Radio Act of 1927. Most of the provisions of this Act were included, seven years later, in what has become known as the Communications Act of 1934. This Act required that broadcasting be conducted “if public convenience, interest, or necessity will be served thereby”.

Owen D. Young, chairman of the Board of the National Broadcasting Company, in his statement to the company of January 30, 1929, declared: “Its aim has never been to make money, but rather to offer programs of such varied interest that our people could not afford to miss them”. NBC considered itself a sort of “steward” of radio and envisioned a vast opportunity for

public service, giving little thought to radio's potentialities as a money-maker.

Lenox R. Lohr, then President of NBC, issued a statement of ideals:

If the NBC can provide the highest quality of program which exists in the United States, no matter where the point of origin may be, and if it can do this without charge upon the listener, and without unfair discrimination between those fairly entitled to use the facilities, it will, in our judgment, have rendered a great service to the American people.\*

NBC knew that it must learn by experiment, and it was willing to experiment. Industry executives at that time were only slightly aware of the complex problems involved in radio broadcasting. The work of artists, engineers, announcers and production directors had to be coordinated; stations and networks, working on split seconds, had to be geared simultaneously; continuities and scripts had to be checked long in advance of broadcast. Multiply these problems by the number of programs during the broadcast hours, night and day. Consider these problems in terms of human beings; add to this the constant consideration that had to be devoted to the appraisal of public opinion, and one gets a slight conception of the hazards of the enterprise. Remember, too, that radio was brand new and there was no place from which they might draw upon previous experience and learn from earlier mistakes.

It is difficult now for any of us to comprehend the detailed amount of study, research, and planning that went into those early days of developing and expanding the radio industry. A letter from David Sarnoff\*\*, then General Manager of RCA, dated June 17, 1922, to R. W. Rice, Jr., Honorary Chair-

---

\* Address by Lenox R. Lohr at biennial meeting, Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, December 7, 1938

\*\* Quoted in Network Broadcasting, a statement by David Sarnoff before FCC, Nov. 14, 1938, p. 31-35

man of the Board of Directors of the General Electric Company, is illuminating:

. . . it seems to me that in seeking a solution to the broadcasting problem, we must recognize that the answer must be along national rather than local lines, for the problem is distinctly a national one . . . I think that the principal elements of broadcasting service are entertainment, information, and education, with emphasis on the first feature — entertainment; although not under-estimating the importance of the other two elements. Expressed in other words, and considered from its broadest aspect, this means that broadcasting represents a job of entertaining, informing, and educating the nation and should, therefore, be distinctly regarded as a public service . . . This kind of a job calls for specialists in the respective fields and that it requires expert knowledge of the public's taste and the manner in which to cater to the public's taste is apparent on the surface . . . Manufacturing companies or communication companies are not at present organized and equipped to do this kind of a job in a consistent and successful way . . . The service to be rendered distinctly calls for a specialized organization with a competent staff capable of meeting the necessities of the situation . . . Let us organize a separate and distinct company, to be known as the Public Service Broadcasting Company, or National Radio Broadcasting Company, or American Radio Broadcasting Company, or some similar name . . . The thought that great as is the public benefactor who endows a library for the purpose of educating the general public, the person who in the future may endow a broadcasting station or a broadcasting service will be a still greater public benefactor because of the many advantages which a broadcasting service offers to all classes of people, not only in the matter of education, but also in entertainment and health services, etc. Important as the library is, it can only provide the written word and at that, it is necessary for people to go to the library in order to avail themselves of its service, whereas in broadcasting, the spoken word is projected into the home where all classes of people may remain and listen.

After five years of hectic development, broadcasting stood at the crossroads. It had to choose: 1) to work out a basis of operation where it would support and maintain itself; in other words, to assume the structure of a private business enterprise; or 2) to seek a government subsidy which would mean a tax on receiving sets and the natural consequence: government control of broadcasting. Fortunately for the United States and

typical of the American spirit, the answer was found by private enterprise.

In 1926, RCA purchased Station WEAF from the American Telephone & Telegraph Company, arranged to lease their lines for inter-connection with other stations and organized the National Broadcasting Company. NBC then took over the experimental program service which the telephone company had instituted, and extended it to a group of independent stations which with WEAF as the key station, became the Red network.

The idea of a national network, proposed by Mr. Sarnoff in 1922, was thus realized in 1926. Network broadcasting was the source of greatly improved programs; it could reach talent wherever it was, throughout the nation, and syndicate the programs over telephone lines to local, independent stations. The network system not only caught on almost immediately with the listeners, but also attracted the business interests of the nation to the use of radio broadcasting as an advertising medium. Radio then quickly became big business. There were three parties whose interests were now at stake: the public, the station owner, and the advertiser.

The public responded immediately by buying radio receivers. By 1929, three years after the linked stations were in operation, sets sold at lower prices until today there is an average of one radio set for every two persons — a higher per capita ownership than in any other country. Radio brought into the home, a new world of ideas, of music, of enjoyment; actually, radio turned a new chapter of America's social history. To the advertiser, the network furnished a large circulation spread over a wide area. And of course, the station owner was in a prospering business.

As radio grew, advertising agencies began to exert their influence in planning and frequently in producing the programs for the highest paying advertisers. As he was the one to pay for it, the advertiser sometimes demanded the right to put on the

kind of production he thought had the widest appeal. The objective of the advertiser was to interest the largest number of listeners by means of performances and programs of the most popular types — even if the presentation was often undignified, boisterous, and unappealing to many listeners. The preference of each individual listener could not be gratified during each period of the broadcasting day. But the effort was made to arrange the day's program schedule so that there would be a balanced ration and that at one period or another, the radio fare would appeal to the taste of every listener.

It naturally followed, then, that if the American people could buy radios, they could turn their dials to their program choice. The type of program that proved to be the most popular, established the pattern for the kind of program that bought the most expensive radio time. And it was these programs that brought the sponsor the most effective advertising.

All the programs that radio provided were available to Americans without the necessity of paying a tax on the ownership of their sets, or any other sort of tax for listening. This privilege is available without cost to the American public only because the broadcasting industry pays its own way. Many Americans are unaware that in other countries, everybody who owns a radio must pay a tax for the privilege of listening. In England, the annual license fee for set owners is one pound for radio alone and two pounds for radio and television combined. In France, each owner of a radio or television set pays a tax of approximately four dollars a year.

Because of the public service responsibility with which radio originated, many people overlook the fact that radio, like any other business, must conform to the requirements of sound business management. Radio had to pay dividends to stockholders; it had to be able to support public service programs (those not paid for by an advertiser); and it had to create a reserve to continue technological research.

American broadcast stations must be understood to be what they are: a business. They are privately owned, developed by private initiative, and supported by private business. They sell radio time and they are competitive. Each station tries to gauge what the public wants, attempts to give it to them, and has to pay for the talent and skills it employs in order to do so.

In its twenty-five years of operation, radio's technical advance and general accomplishments have been phenomenal. It has become an indispensable factor in public morale. It must be appraised by the effect it has upon the daily lives of the people of America. More than one hundred and five million persons constitute the listening audience, amongst whom are the sick, the isolated, and the under-privileged, to whom radio is a boon beyond price. In the words of David Sarnoff: "The richest man cannot buy for himself what the poorest man gets free by radio".

Any evaluation of the broadcasting industry must consider, in addition to its economic importance, its cultural impact on our national life. Indeed, we may go further and say that however we conduct our programming, it is sharply analyzed abroad as an index to our relationship to the rest of the world.

While this business was still in its infancy, barely fifteen years old, its giant offspring — television — was given official blessing and sent on its commercially sanctioned way July 1, 1941. There were numberless problems of radio that had not yet been solved, and now to these were added those of television. While the problems of freedom of the press and censorship of films have been under study for years, the problems of radio and television "freedoms" are almost unexplored. In many other countries, freedom or control of radio, government or private operation of radio and television stations, monopoly or multiple ownership, are vital questions. We take for granted our system of competitive private ownership. Many take exception to the repetition of the "commercials" which

make broadcasting time worth while as an advertising medium. Those who object should ask themselves who would pay for the programs if not the advertisers.

American broadcasters are particularly concerned with the freedom to transmit information by radio and television. The premise that the radio channels are public property inspired the communication laws of the United States. The law which regulates broadcasting in this country is the Communications Act of 1934, which is administered by our Federal Communications Commission (FCC).

Licenses granting the right to operate a broadcasting station are granted for short periods only. Opinions vary with regard to the rights of press and radio. Each is subject to completely different rules and regulations. This issue has always been one of concern to legislators; now it concerns broadcasters as well. It is a vital issue of the day. In 1949, it was brought before an international forum: the 4th Inter-American Radio Conference held in Washington, D.C. After prolonged debate, this forum recommended "that the American Governments promulgate the necessary measures to give the expression of thought on the radio the same effective guarantees of freedom as the press enjoys". \*

Radio, and now television, have never been entirely free from government rules and regulations. The government gives broadcasting stations the time of operation, hours, power of station, in order to limit the range of their broadcast. This is necessary to avoid broadcasting interference and chaos. The Federal Communications Commission has the "power to determine what facilities shall be made available, to enlarge or to cut down facilities originally assigned, to refuse facilities to the less worthy services, and even entirely to replace them with others that are more worthy".

---

\* Arno Huth, "Freedom to Listen", United Nations Publication (E/CN.4/Sub. 1/80 and Corr. 1), p. 3

The American broadcasting industry, recognizing the need for self-regulation, organized the National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters. This Association, which includes in its membership seventy-two stations and two networks, of the country's one hundred and eight television stations and four television networks, has established a code of practices for television stations.\* The code is in three sections. The first provides rules for "advancement of education and culture, acceptability of program material, responsibility toward children, decency and decorum in production, community responsibility, treatment of news and public events, controversial public issues, religious programs." Section 2 deals with advertising practices and Section 3 sets up the five man review board which is chosen from the industry. Any complaints of violations of the code are filed with the review board, but the decision for action rests with the television board which must hold appropriate hearings.

In connection with the present agitation now in the House of Representatives, designed to provide legislation to eliminate alleged "abuses" in the realm of programming — the broadcasting industry by far prefers to censor its own programs. It fears that legislation concerning programming is apt to be ill-advised. Its best defense would seem to be a vigorous enforcement of the industry Association's own code.

For ten years the television industry operated at a loss. It was only on March 7, 1952, that the FCC reported that television had now become a principal source of revenue for the broadcasting networks and that the industry made a profit, for the first time, in 1951.

It was apparent from the early days of TV that when certain technical difficulties were straightened out, television sets and installations would be consistently reduced in price, following the history of radio receivers. Though TV is a more

---

\* New York Times, Jan. 30, 1952

expensive and more complicated operation than radio, its impact and fascination is so much greater, that its wide acceptance has been almost immediate.

In 1942, it was estimated that about 10,000 home television receivers had been installed in the United States before manufacture was restricted to provide for war needs, and nine television transmitters in the nation. Today, there are nearly 18,000,000 television sets tuned to 108 television stations.

Commercial broadcasters, engaged in a profitable business, naturally would like as many channels as the FCC would allot them. The demand for TV channels is far beyond the number available. Aware of the increasing demand for licenses (for the naturally limited number of air channels), the FCC, on September 30, 1948, issued its "freeze order". This "froze" new or pending applications until the Commission could appropriately study the entire matter of channel allocations, and its own Rules and Regulations governing them.

Educational interests in this country realized that before this freeze was lifted, they must appeal to the FCC to set aside certain TV channels for non-commercial, educational purposes. As stated in the NEA Journal of November, 1950:

It is time for us to realize that if we continue our indifference, one of the greatest forces in education will be lost to us by default. If we don't make a strong showing for our rights to TV channels soon, we will muff our opportunities in TV too. Strong commercial interests are rapidly seizing the available TV channels . . .

The Joint Committee on Educational Television was formed to represent, advise, and assist a group of seven national educational organizations in this effort.

After hearings (extending from October 16, 1950 to January 31, 1951) and further study and consideration of the entire record, the FCC on April 14, 1952, issued its TV Allocation Report. This set aside for exclusive by non-commercial ed-

educational interests, channel assignments in 242 communities in the United States. These allotments represent about 11.5 of the nation's available air waves.

Although reinforced with a strong social conscience and the high idealism to enrich the life of every family in these United States, non-commercial broadcasters, without the revenue, without the advertisers, without the stockholders, are at a disadvantage. In our country, the idea of a TV broadcasting station for educational purposes exclusively, introduces a new note. All of us must learn to talk about, think about, write about, plan for educational programs. We must know what kind of information we would like broadcast into our homes. We must be aware of the things we want to learn; know what we would like explained. Once each community creates a climate of opinion about this kind of television programming, the solution of this problem will be encouraged.

There are those who realize the need and the value to our country of keeping our citizens informed; of making knowledge accessible to them (so accessible, indeed, that it comes to them right in their own homes); of the benefits that result when people are interested and active in their community life and projects. In other words, when the air waves are used for more complete service, the individual, the community and the country will assuredly gather the benefits.

At the FCC hearings in Washington, Belmont Farley of the NEA, said:

In presenting the claims of education for a share in what has been recognized by the creation of the FCC as the peculiar property of the National Commonwealth, I wish to emphasize the fact that these claims are supported by long established precedent in allocating portions of the public domain in aid to enterprises having a direct bearing on public welfare . . . Public lands were reserved principally for the *financial support* of education. Any other type of financial support, equally generous and stable, would have been just as great a benefit to schools as was the subsidy which came from the sale or in-

come of public lands . . . We have in the radio spectrum, however, not a *source of revenue* for education, but an important *instrument of education* — an instrument for which there is no substitute, an instrument once definitely allocated to other than educational purposes is lost permanently to school systems and institutions of learning . . . Once the channels which the nation's schools and colleges now seek to share are allocated to private rather than public interest, they are lost to education forever . . .

And from Marion Rex Trabue, Dean of the School of Education, Penn State College, the FCC heard the following:

Educational TV should not generally be expected to pay for itself financially. If all TV channels are allocated now to commercial use, however, the people of America will in the future be denied many rich opportunities for learning new skills, new facts, and new attitudes that would be of great importance and value to them . . . The plea which I make for educational TV channels is not based in any way on their monetary value. I am interested in their potential contributions to more intelligent political, social, personal, and economic action by American citizens than can ever be expected of these citizens if their viewing of TV programs is to be controlled entirely by persons who seek only to entertain and exploit them.

Today, human beings throughout the world are surrounded by various complex problems: economic, political, industrial, racial, and personal. The past does not afford us any simple solutions to the profound difficulties that beset the contemporary world. From where is the public to get the proper understanding of issues that surround us? An elementary knowledge of science that could help in this Atomic Age? A better knowledge of the lives of our great leaders that will indicate to us how they met the problems of their own times? A better knowledge of the history of our country — how we became a great nation? A knowledge of the propaganda techniques of our enemies, so that each of us can analyze propaganda and learn how to judge the truth? Hygiene in every day living? A better understanding and appreciation of one's self, and of other people?

Television, the medium of communication that has been developed in this troubled age, could aid in providing the answers. Thoughtful programming directed to the needs of each community, would help towards the solution of some perplexing problems. It becomes essential that our individual, community, national, and international problems be approached with open-mindedness. It is common good sense to seek help and accept it when it is given. If a TV station offers a program that is needed by the community, it is important for us to let that station know it is giving the community a desirable service and that we will support it.

In summing up the background of broadcasting, then, we conclude that the great contributions of the commercial broadcasting industry must be fully appreciated. The development and expansion of radio and television in three decades is unprecedented. The talents the industry has brought to itself, the industry's willingness and ability to experiment in all directions and the millions it has poured into the development of broadcasting until we have the technological wonder familiar to most of us, represent an enormous contribution to progress.

There remains much to do that has not yet been done. The future use of television will determine its ultimate value. The FCC, the governmental body regulating this giant, must recognize that its responsibility goes beyond the mere setting aside of 242 channels for education. It must give educational institutions sufficient time within which to arrange for the financing of stations, and in other respects its rules must make it practically possible for educational stations to operate. The influence of television will not abate through the years. It must be regarded as a natural resource to serve the public's best interests.

## CHAPTER II

### THE NEED FOR A SUPPLEMENTARY SYSTEM

We have not yet experienced all the benefits which TV can attain for us. For one reason or another, broadcasters are not clearly aware of its unique nature. It has been used principally in three ways: as radio with pictures added, as vaudeville, as home movies. The clamor for a supplementary system to commercial television has grown in proportion to the ever-increasing number of set owners. Perhaps this can be explained by the instinctive feeling that TV is something more than entertainment offered by radio, vaudeville, and motion pictures and that it holds unique opportunities for the common man to participate in and to make a contribution to the stirring events of our time.

The popular view in support of a supplementary system of television, was highlighted by the support it received from Raymond Rubicam, founder of Young & Rubicam, one of the largest advertising agencies in the world. In a letter to Senator William Benton of Connecticut (once partner in Benton & Bowles, which controlled most of the soap operas on the air), Mr. Rubicam complained that radio broadcasting has not served the American people as well as it should have.

'I am convinced', he writes, 'that a large part of the reason lies in the domination of radio by the advertiser . . . Even when I was most active in advertising and in radio I held the same views and would have welcomed a reduction of the percentage of radio time available to advertisers and an enlargement of the public's opportunity to hear programs which have little worth for the advertiser but great worth for the public . . . What I am opposed to is what amounts practically to a monopoly of

radio and television by advertisers to the point where the public's freedom of choice in programs is more of a theory than a fact and to the point where public service of the two media is only a shadow of what it could be . . . Radio programming in the United States has been comparable to a school system in which everything stopped at the elementary grades . . . and which consequently had no colleges, universities or post-graduate schools to serve the rest of the population . . .'

As the word "commercial" indicates, the necessities of commerce govern a commercial system of broadcasting. That simply means a commercial system must sell time. Hence, all the kinds of information that are essential for survival in a complex world must be regarded by commercial broadcasters exactly as they regard all types of material used in programming: as a commodity. Many of the insights which each individual needs if he is to perform his democratic duties effectively can be made available through television programming. The acquisition of these insights should not be dependent upon the sale of time. This is apt to be a dangerous procedure and as Norbert Weiner\* has pointed out — the thing which makes information unsuitable as a commodity. This is perhaps the principal reason why we need a supplementary system whose operations are not determined by the need to sell time — the basis of most of the criticism of commercial television.

The Gabby Hayes programs which went on the air for the first time on October 1, 1950, present a classic illustration of this point. These programs dramatized the lives of great Americans: they were done with brilliant showmanship and were high in educational value. Young and old alike found them fascinating. They advertised hot cereals and because city kids apparently don't eat as much hot cereal as the sales research department of the sponsor thought they should, these fine programs were taken off TV.

---

\*The Human Use of Human Beings. Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1950. p. 125.

It is in rural areas which the Mutual radio network can reach that hot cereals are in demand. In the large cities, where television stations are located, cold cereals sell best. Thus, these fine programs of both entertainment and educational importance, were taken off NBC TV on December 23rd and transferred to Mutual Radio. We must agree with Mr. Jack Gould's evaluation of the incident:\*

Good business the change undoubtedly is, but the cultural implications are infinitely more intriguing. Is the child of the television age to be denied American history if he doesn't like his cereal hot? Are the humanities and sciences to become the week-end special in the local super-markets? Is the youngster of tomorrow to be flunked out if he wants his ham sandwich on rye and not on white? Television really must come to its senses. What may be eminently sound reasoning in the advertising world cannot be allowed to become an absolute criterion for determining the programs to be seen by children. A stockholder and a schoolchild are two quite different persons whose needs are by no means always the same. Parents have long since ceased to be amused by the continuing cancellation or curtailment of what few good programs there are for children on TV.

The traditional medium of education has been the printed page. We have been brought up in a world in which ideas have been communicated primarily through newspapers, books, and magazines. We have regarded television viewing as a kind of activity contrary to, and distinct from the world of books. The printed page was a vehicle for ideas; television for entertainment.

It is time that we reconsidered this thinking, which is no longer in keeping with the new picture era that has rather suddenly burst in upon us. It would seem quite obvious that television will effect a cultural revolution as important for our world, as printing was for the Renaissance. As a result, attitude and behavior will henceforth be more decisively determined by what people look at than by what they read.

---

\* New York Times, Dec. 11, 1951

If we regard television as the most powerful medium yet created by man for the dissemination of ideas, we will have a better perspective as to what its structure should be. A most interesting parallel is offered by the organization of the publishing industry in this country. Side by side with the highly developed commercial book publishing business, there exist two other non-commercial publishing structures. They are the press establishments of various universities and the federal government publishing activities. Each of these publishing outlets fills a need which cannot be found through the commercial publisher. All knowing Americans are today familiar with inflated costs and that these costs have curtailed the production of many commercial publishers. These publishers have had to cut corners in many ways, one of them being to publish only "sure-fire" stuff and another to give up entirely the publishing of "prestige books". As a result the university and government presses have published many books that would never otherwise have seen the light of day.

There are forty-four American university presses operating as a decentralized venture, scattered throughout the country. They include those at Harvard, Columbia, Fordham, Princeton, Catholic University, Duke, and University of Florida; at Minnesota, Iowa, Indiana, and Texas; at Washington, Stanford, and New Mexico. They are today at the height of their importance to the intellectual life of the nation. Their "principal function has always been that of filling vacuums, since they operate chiefly in fields which are either entirely neglected or badly slighted by commercial publishers."\*

They have somewhat of an advantage over the publishing industry inasmuch as they do not need to show a profit and are expected to guard the enduring values. Their function as seekers and purveyors of the truth has resulted in many excit-

---

\* Frank H. Wardlaw, *Tips to Type* 22; *Saturday Review of Literature*, June 16, 1951, p. 12

ing ventures for them. They have taken chances that would curdle the blood of the average commercial publisher, and a great many of them have proven worthwhile. Such ventures stimulate further research. They have, also, resulted in a wide variety of productive contributions. Not only have they stimulated the research of the specialist, but they have also raised the general level of awareness of the layman.

It must be remembered that such a press requires substantial financial aid in the beginning and that it will always need some support unless it is to become an out-and-out business enterprise. The parent, the university itself, sees to its subsidy, for this is one of the essential media with which the educator concerns himself for the distribution of information, ideas, and attitudes.

Many of us are unacquainted with the magnitude and complexity of the output of the United States Government printing office. This agency has a list of 65,000 titles and an annual output of 127,000,000 copies. Approximately one hundred federal governmental units are engaged in fact finding in every field of human endeavor of public concern. Somewhere between 15,000 and 20,000 publications are authored by the federal government annually.

The government publishes these books and pamphlets to further or assist a certain governmental process. Government publications, in addition to being by a certain agency, about a certain subject, are printed for a certain purpose and fulfil various functions. These include the annual reports of departments; documents conveying certain useful information to individuals or specific groups of people; research publications; and informational publications which explain the functions of particular departments and urge the public to take advantage of the privileges and services the government makes available to them.

This governmental publishing activity and the endeavor

of the university presses, exist alongside our extensive commercial publishing industry. None of these competes with the others; none is injurious to the others; each supplements the others; each serves a function indispensable to the best interests of our national life. The thinking and interest which government publications stimulate, the need which the university press fills in its particular community and as outlet for the important research and educational findings within its own university, supplement the publications of the commercial publishing industry and create a better market for the commercial product. To use a biological term, the relationship is a symbiotic one: each thrives on the existence of the other.

The purposes of the federal government and university presses, in maintaining extensive publishing endeavors, are the precise purposes underlying the creation of a supplementary system of non-commercial television broadcasting. The existing relationship between commercial and non-commercial publishers certainly would be desirable between commercial and non-commercial broadcasters. Such a relationship would be most equable for the emerging structure of television broadcasting. All the precedents and experience of government, university, and commercial publishers can serve as an able guide to commercial and non-commercial broadcasters. When the broadcasters arrive at the same kind of relationship that exists among the publishers, we may expect from television the rich contributions to our national well being that the era of print has given us in books.

The historic function of print over the past 300 years is now apparently to be superseded in part by the picture era. Regarding television from this angle, we can then better understand what its organizational structure should be. The printing and publishing industries have been the purveyors of learning, ideas, and entertainment. As the evolutionary cycle turns, television will supplement and improve upon the earlier media.

The desire to create mass audiences which makes any program a more expensive advertising property, frequently perverts the information purpose of discussion programs. Leo Cherne has remarked on the extraordinary manner in which entertainment has intruded on a field formerly preoccupied with information.\*

Frequently, indeed, entertainment values dominate the newspaper. The column, the comic strip, the feature, the picture, are not a supplement to news but a substitute for it. There is, of course, nothing wrong with entertainment per se. What is dangerous is the acceptance of entertainment as news, the assumption that we have been informed when we have only been amused.

As Mr. Cherne points out, the most serious confusion of entertainment and information occurs in radio and television. Huge audiences listen to discussion programs and believe that they have been informed. They are imbued with strong points of view which may or may not be based on adequate information. TV discussion programs, which must be lively and entertaining too, seem to suggest that snap judgments may be validly formed on the basis of less than thirty minutes of discussion. Above all else, discussion should make the viewer aware of the complexity of the subject that is presented and the limits of his knowledge. The pattern for this kind of intellectual exploration may be expected as one of the principal contributions of educational TV. It is the spirit in which our universities conduct their daily business. A specific example is the distinguished HORIZONS program that Columbia University has presented during the past year, over the ABC network.

The question is often asked as to why separate channels for education and separate channels for commercially operated stations, are necessary. The experience of educational broad-

---

\* Leo M. Cherne, Biggest Question on TV Debates.  
New York Times Magazine, March 2, 1952

casters who have tried to maintain continuous programs on commercial networks, gives important support to the claim for the need of a supplementary system. The following is offered as more or less representative of the experience of education in radio. It is taken from a report by the Commission on Civic Education by Radio, the National Advisory Council on Radio in Education, and the American Political Science Association. It records the history of what has been called the irrepressible conflict between educational and commercial broadcasting.

A network approached the National Advisory Council on Radio in Education, early in 1932, with an offer of one-half hour free time for four years, to present an educational program on Tuesday nights from 8:00 to 8:30. The Council accepted and with eagerness conferred with leaders in its field so they might arrive at a comprehensive four-year program on civic education. They were without precedents in the field of educational broadcasting and questions with regard to subject matter, technique of presentation, participation, etc., were settled as a matter of judgment. Without regard for the time they invested and with great energy, they launched their series of programs on civic education. They were hampered in operation by lack of adequate funds. They cut out all fees for speakers and compensation for Council members. But they broadcast 210 programs which had an enthusiastic response from classrooms and listeners at home.

Less than a year after the half-hour period was offered and accepted for four years, the network sold that Tuesday night half hour and without consultation with the Council, offered another half hour at an earlier time. Shortly after, because time on affiliates of the networks had been sold, more rearrangements were necessary. And so it continued; there were more and more shifts of time period until finally the broadcasting time was reduced to fifteen minutes.

Such a program loses its appeal and value because of irregularity of programming. It becomes hidden in an inconspicuous time and eventually no one knows when it is on the air. As troublesome as the shifts of time were the difficulties involved in maintaining a nation-wide network to carry the program regularly through the year. The situation became more difficult as time went on and as the demand for radio time increased by private business.

After four years of broadcasting, the program went off the air.

One of the best developed, most varied, and extensively promoted educational programs was cut off chiefly on the point of its successful conduct for four years. This is whimsical and fantastic and would be amusing except for its serious consequences . . . The Committee has acknowledged . . . its gratitude and appreciation . . . of the opportunity afforded by the (network) . . . and for the valuable and generous assistance it has given in the production of the programs . . . We recognize the seriousness of the conflict of interest between educational and commercial broadcasting, but that has not in the slightest degree marred the cordiality of our feelings toward the personnel of the Broadcasting Company . . .\*

The report of NACRE, "Four Years of Network Broadcasting", quotes Dr. Robert M. Hutchins on what they regard as the characteristic situation in which educational broadcasters find themselves when they rely on commercial time for their programs:

One cannot escape the impression that broadcasters have used so-called education programs either for political reasons (to show how public-spirited they are), or as stop-gaps in the absence of paying material. This has resulted not only in the frequent change of hours, but in the donation of the poorest hours. It is natural . . . that the best hours should be sold; they bring

---

\* A report by the Committee on Civic Education by Radio of the National Advisory Council on Radio in Education (NACRE) and the American Political Science Association, *Four Years of Network Broadcasting*, Chicago, Univ. of Chic. Press, 1937, p. iii - iv

the best price. But the hours that are best are best because most people are not free at other times. The finest education programs in the world will not diffuse much education if the people who want education are . . . earning a living while the programs are on the air . . .\*

This kind of experience illustrates the precarious position of education on the air and the background of the thinking that has conditioned the attitude of educators in regard to the necessity for their own channels.

The testimony of Harold B. McCarty, before the FCC, stands out in sharp contrast to the experience of the Commission on Civic Education by Radio, the National Advisory Council on Radio in Education, and the American Political Science Association. Mr. McCarty, Director of the University of Wisconsin School of the Air, which operates its own transmitter, gave a brief history of his station's activities. He summarized the significance of his experience in the following statement:

Experience teaches us that information and instruction, continuing sound education, may be expected to issue only from a center of learning or an educational community such as a great university. Radio education and by implication, TV education may be expected to emerge most authentically from an educational home. The freedom which radio education and television education require may be enjoyed only when broadcasting facilities are controlled and operated by institutions and are available to them without this direct conflict with business. I think there can be no escaping that conclusion. So long as education is put in the position of competing for popularity with entertainment, so long will it be crowded out because we are by nature lovers of diversion and recreation and entertainment rather than study. Learning is a hard job and . . . fewer people are interested . . . than are willing to be entertained . . . If you took a popularity poll of the children of the 6th grade of any school . . . asking whether they wished to go to a movie or have a science lesson, there is no doubt about what would happen . . . But you cannot subject education to that kind of competition and structure which brings into the arena of popularity and clamor for public support education as against entertainment . . .

---

\* Ibid, p. 69

In further corroboration of this point of view, the Commissioners of the Federal Communications Commission stated in their Third Notice:

In general, the need for non-commercial educational television stations was based upon the important contributions which non-commercial educational television stations can make in educating the people both in school — at all levels — and also the adult public. The need for such stations was justified upon the high quality type of programming which would be available on such stations — programming of an entirely different character from that available on most commercial stations.

The need for keeping the operations of education and commercial broadcasting separate and distinct is written into Section 57 of the Sixth Report and Order of the FCC. It reads:

A grant of the requests . . . for partial commercial operation by educational institutions would tend to vitiate the differences between commercial operation and non-commercial educational operation . . . The objective for which special educational reservations have been established — i.e., the establishment of a genuinely educational type of service — would not be furthered by permitting educational institutions to operate in substantially the same manner as commercial applicants though they may choose to call it limited commercial non-profit operation.

It is important that we re-examine and readjust our attitudes with regard to the function of television in our lives. Commercial enterprises, by their inherent nature, are limited in the very respects that non-commercial structures can act more freely. Because of inflated costs, some commercial ventures find their backs against the wall. Non-commercial broadcasting enterprises can keep alive the elements of regional culture without which America would be so much poorer. A non-commercial system must face serious problems of financing; it cannot exist without subsidy. Those who use the air waves have an obligation to include programs whose purpose is other than entertainment and the sale of goods. They have implicit responsibilities to the public which supports it and at whose tolerance it contin-

ues. Broadcasts of a serious, informative nature are best handled by educators and other specialists in that field. The educator has always been a servant of the people, entrusted with two principal goals: to further and improve social progress by passing along the best in patterns of thought, and to prepare the way for the orderly correction of recognized shortcomings of human society.

### CHAPTER III

#### A PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION FOR TV

Television, a consequence of contemporary technology, must be utilized as a teaching device if contemporary man is to understand the circumstances under which he lives. Society is characterized today by constantly changing, new political and social situations with which the twentieth century seems unable to cope. As in the poem of Matthew Arnold, we seem to be

Wandering between two worlds, one dead.

The other powerless to be born.

The world that we knew before the bomb exploded is gone. The world that could be we do not yet know how to create.

We have been told that our modern world is one of frustration, insecurity, and confusion. The atom bomb, the development of the airplane, TV itself, have created a tremendous movement which is now in process. There is no inherent historical guarantee that this movement must be forward. Hitler was able to use the great advance of modern technology to maintain an evil, barbaric regime. TV can be so used that it could contribute to a new dark age worse than any barbarism that history has known. Technological tools are intrinsically neither good nor evil. The manner in which they are used determines their value.

The "One World" envisaged by Wendell Willkie seems far away. Before the kind of world all of us dream about can come into being, the problem of a world divided against itself must be solved. How? The only hope for a solution lies in society itself; in an informed and enlightened society.

An outstanding characteristic of our time is the complexity of modern social organization and the interdependence of nations.\* What do we know about other nations — their beliefs, their customs, the way they live, the food they eat? It is impossible to be friendly without understanding. Modern air travel, films, television — all have conquered the ramparts of distance and made this world a neighborhood, through which runs Main Street. The expression that war is total became commonplace during World War II; we have learned since then that peace, too, is total.

What is it that we have to offer the rest of the world? We have given generously of our men, our money, our supplies of all description. Has it brought unity and understanding to a world in conflict? The great value that we possess, that does not exist anywhere else in the rest of the world, is our concept of individual freedom. Do we ourselves understand the significance of that concept? Do we fully understand the privileges, the rights and the responsibilities that being a member of a democracy entails?

Our democratic government emphasizes the rights of the individual and guarantees those rights. It acknowledges that the individual is endowed with the capacity to grow, to realize his own potentials, and to contribute to civilization. It acknowledges that the individual is able to make decisions, can take the responsibility for these decisions, and can have respect for others who have their own right to the same things as he. This is the moral concept of democracy. Its practical meaning is to be found in the development and growth of every member of this democratic society.

Our democratic theory would have a man consider his freedom a personal possession the same as his house, his books,

---

\* See Hanson W. Baldwin, Dissection of the 'Fortress America' Idea, New York Times Magazine, Aug. 17, 1952, for interdependence of nations in regard to our own military security.

his jewelry, his clothes, his car. Would a man be disinterested if some foreign power decided to take over his home? If he had a chance to vote on it, would he care enough to cast a ballot? Men have been known to take great precautions against theft, and many people carry burglary insurance. What precaution is man in this democracy taking against the foreign power that would threaten his personal freedom? The question is — does he know that he, personally, can take precautions?

The existence, growth, and survival of democracy depends upon citizens who are emotionally and intellectually mature. The degree of development and self-realization of the citizens of our country is the barometer upon which our future will rise or fall. The democratic spirit is based on the spirituality, the goodness, that is inherent in man. To say that we have already achieved everything that democracy can be and can mean is as wrong as to say that because a child shows some talent in painting he will excel the skill of Rembrandt. Democracy means far more than the absence of autocracy.

The democratic spirit must further be developed within each of us. And the responsibilities for achieving it lie upon each one of us; it is not for our leaders alone. It is a fallacy to believe that individuals in a democracy will by themselves just naturally fall into democratic ways. Democracy implies too much to expect people will just naturally "get it". They must be taught. More than any other system of government, democracy requires an informed citizenry.

TV is the one medium which, properly used, can meet the needs of education en masse. The process of education must be one which the adult continues after formal classroom education has ceased. Antiquated methods of teaching must be abandoned. Considering the crucial state of the world today it is now imperative that modern education catch up with the twentieth century. The many new facts which the inhabitants of the small towns and big cities must learn, and learn quickly, if

they and America are to survive in an era of continuous change, can be communicated best through TV. Cultural, social, spiritual, and economic values must be re-stated and reaffirmed. The actions and reactions of man must be better understood. What disturbs individual (as well as international) relationships, is *fear*. This basic truth is the key to understanding.

Of greatest importance, then, is the need to make knowledge understandable so it can be applied to the conditions of living as we actually know them. It is the task of education to have people feel related to the actual world; not a dream world. The enormity of this task of re-educating does not seem insurmountable when one considers the potentials of television. A steady series of programs coming into the home regularly, at certain hours, certain days, week after week, month after month, and year after year would remove the reluctance of adults to go back to the classroom. TV would bring the classroom into the home and raise the potential for adult education to new levels.

There is support for this attitude in contemporary psychology. Dr. Karen Horney, eminent psychoanalyst, has said:

My own belief is that man has the capacity as well as the desire to develop his potentialities and become a decent human being, and that these deteriorate if his relationship to others and hence to himself is, and continues to be disturbed. I believe that man can change and go on changing as long as he lives. And this belief has grown with deeper understanding.

We know that the exercise of democratic responsibilities is fulfilled when the average man understands his duties. When he knows that his behavior will effect the outcome of social and political problems, he considers the situation seriously. Two practical expressions of the exercise of democratic responsibility, where the citizen knew what the issues were and exerted an influence on those issues, were the Kefauver investigations and the national conventions.

Over a period of years, the American public did not respond to the frequent and recurring charges of corruption in

government that appeared in newspapers, magazines, books, campaign speeches, and other public addresses. Their attitude was one of amused tolerance; an attitude that does not beget action. In 1950, the United States Senate appointed a special committee to investigate organized crime in interstate commerce, popularly known as the Kefauver Committee. Its hearings were open to the public and were held in various large United States cities. There was the usual response from an apathetic public. But when, in 1951, the hearings in New York City were conducted before TV cameras, the extraordinary response in the few days' time that the hearings were televised, proved a powerful and effective factor in arousing the same public out of its state of apathy and tolerance. It quickly changed to a shocked, bitter, and angry public.

The consequence of this single proceeding created an interesting situation. There were many political overturns in November, 1951, which were attributed to popular resentment. Rudolph Halley, counsel to the Committee, was elected to the New York City Council and Senator Kefauver himself became a presidential candidate in 1952. The attitudes and resulting activation of the public that could not be created through all the other media of public information were in this instance dramatically, decisively, and instantaneously produced by presentation on the TV screen.

Perhaps the outstanding example of citizen participation in a national event is to be found in the telecasting of the 1952 Republican and Democratic National Conventions. As in the case of the Kefauver investigations, these exciting programs gave millions of Americans their first insight into the nature and proceedings of a political convention. While these national presidential nominating conventions have been a feature of American life for more than a century, it had to wait for TV — a single medium — to carry the convention story vividly to the American people. At this writing, it is expected that the interest

stimulated by what was seen and heard will bring out a record breaking vote in the presidential election this year.

Many millions of people outside the convention hall actually saw what happened there and reacted to it. Their reactions will undoubtedly create drastic changes in the conduct of nominating conventions in the future. Senator Ed Johnson of Colorado, chairman of the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee (which acts on all legislation effecting the broadcasting industry), expressed his opinion:

. . . A person watching a convention on television knew more about what took place than any delegate on the floor . . . There is no doubt that television will improve conventions . . . The purpose will be to present conventions in their best light to the 100,000,000 people who will be looking in on them in 1956 . . . They may not get shorter, but they will be greatly improved from the audience viewpoint . . . Much of the time-wasting procedure will be eliminated and something much more entertaining and educational will be substituted.\*

Life magazine editorially agreed with Senator Johnson:

The only way to clean up politics is to clean up the apathy of the American voter. By getting millions of our citizenry to follow, blow by blow, the nominating conventions — one of the most important institutions in our life as a people — TV has already contributed mightily toward that end. If televising Congress would contribute further, we're wholeheartedly for it. Once our citizenry starts following politics as it follows baseball what a country we'll have.

With TV cameras recording even the committee meetings at the conventions, they now take on the new form of national town meetings. No one wants to see these great political circuses abandoned. They are famous for rousing enthusiasm; they make party workers of different states acquainted with one another; and they give a sense of nation-wide purpose that can hardly be attained in any other way.

---

\* Variety, July 30, 1952

The New York Times commented:

. . . If we look at the results of the two conventions this year we have to admit that in spite of the difficulties of the convention system public opinion, both within and without the convention, does make itself heard and felt. We need not suppose for a moment that the majority of the professional politicians in control of the two parties would have made General Eisenhower or Governor Stevenson their first choice. They accepted these candidates because the popular pressure in favor of the two men suggested the best chance for victory in November. That suggestion somehow penetrated into the convention hall . . .

Since the networks incurred a loss of about three million dollars on broadcasting the 1952 conventions, due to the lengthy sessions and many hours of air time that greatly exceeded the estimates, it would seem that future convention telecasting would fall into the lap of an educational transmitter. It is education, and public service too. But who is to pay for it?

A philosophy of education, in which TV can assume such a significant role, is consistent with the consensus of thinking expressed by educational leaders in their testimony before the FCC during the hearings of 1950-51. Excerpts from this testimony are given in the following paragraphs.

Superintendent Mark C. Schinnerer, of the Cleveland Public Schools:

. . . Each generation faces life anew. Each passing day life requires more and more adjustment. Even to the informed, the problems of our community are perplexing indeed. Less than half of our voters have received a high school education. How adequately can they make difficult choices? . . . If a TV home for education is not established, what assurance have we that this ultimate in communication, television, will ever be used systematically in American classrooms? If the history of radio is repeated, then school TV will never exist with any continuity unless it becomes part and parcel of our whole educational scheme.

Earl J. McGrath, United States Commissioner of Education:  
tion:

Education depends upon communication. Thoughts and ideas, the material of education, have to be transmitted and disseminated. In an earlier day, when word of mouth communication to a visible audience was the sole means of reaching a circle of listeners, the Bill of Rights forbade the federal government to abridge the freedom of assembly or of speech. With the broadcasting of sound, freedom of assembly became less important educationally and freedom of speech more important; freedom of access to the radio became essential to the effective exercise of the right to freedom of speech. If the purpose of democracy to secure the universal enlightenment of its members is to be served, education must at all times be assured of access to the means of mass communication. This principle must be recognized in the field of TV.

Superintendent Vaughn D. Seidel, of Alameda County, California:

. . . We feel that education is so basically fundamental to a democracy that no opportunity should be missed for improving the service which education renders to the public. We recognize in TV a new facility which we believe will substantially improve educational services in a way that has not proved possible through the printed page, motion pictures, or radio. It combines the advantages of these other media of communication, offers an opportunity never before available to reach a widely scattered audience in an effective way, and brings contemporary history to an already gathered audience in public schools, colleges, universities, and in the home. It is our contention that one of the major contributions that TV can make to education is coverage of history in the making; contemporaneous events, both on a local and a national scale.

Constance Warren, of the American Association of University Women, and retired president of Sarah Lawrence College:

. . . (TV) cannot be allowed to come into American homes unless for the best interests of that home . . . (We) are conscious that our members are deeply devoted to the underlying American principle that each individual is of tremendous importance to our society and that each must be educated to perform well his

duties to society . . . AAUW members . . . desire that educational opportunities be extended to other men and women. They cannot, therefore, stand quietly by and watch a potential tool for mass education being limited in its usefulness . . .

Educational broadcasters have defined their purpose in the following statement of aims:

- 1.) To inform.
- 2.) Through information properly presented, to provide stimulus to the individual that will find expression in action.
- 3.) Interpreting both complexities and simple truths in terms of the listening audiences, always aiming for better human relations and adjustment.
- 4.) Informing how it is possible, and inviting, the individual to participate in his community life and the culture of his society.
- 5.) Acting as an outlet for the many forces within the community — voicing their opinion; expression of the various groups and associations within the community which the station serves; and acting as a force within the community, to help solve its problems.
- 6.) Leading the way, by experiment, toward new forms and activities of broadcasting. People cannot know what they like, nor know if they like it, until they have experienced it. If broadcasters provide that variety, which permits and encourages the development of tastes and interests, it implies on their part, an obligation to experiment with both form and content.\*

---

\* Allerton House Conference at Univ. of Ill., Jun-July 1949.  
Report on Educational Broadcasting, p. 3

TV can be of the greatest value in bringing into being the goals which Dr. William S. Carlson, president of the State University of New York, defined as the purpose of education. He called upon educators to work with other community agencies to promote health and welfare, to develop a purposeful uniformity of educational philosophy that would help bring into the world, individuals who are intellectually curious, physically hardy, and emotionally stable.

To achieve this ideal, we must provide not only for the intellectually elite, but for the rank and file. We must assist in encouraging the thinker, the creative artist, the research scientist and the leader in political affairs. We must also give meaning and a sense of creative direction to those destined to be followers. In democratic education, we must give everyone an opportunity to seek out the contribution that he, and he alone—as a unique personality — can make. We must stress intellectual individuality and freedom of thought and opinion. We must combat any attempt to establish cultural sausage-factories that produce conformist digits who submit so willingly to the toxic tyranny of money, material possessions and smoking-car standards of popularity.\*

We know that for children, TV has from the beginning held extreme fascination. Surveys, reports, experiments — all have been conducted to determine if TV is harmful. No one has proved that it is. However, we know that many children spend twenty-five hours or more a week watching the TV screen. They watch with an interest and avidity that they seldom evince in the classroom. We pour billions into our educational structure for the purpose of imparting desirable attitudes and skills. There is little question that at the present time much of what is presented on TV between the hours of 3:00 p.m. and 9 p.m. is in direct contradiction to the values that are taught from 9 a.m. to 3 p.m. We should be concerned about the possible social wastefulness of pouring billions into an educational structure

---

\* New York Times, May 1, 1952

from 9:00 to 3:00, whose values may be nullified between 3:00 and 9:00.

Teachers must know that they are the objects of invidious comparison. Faye Emerson, in her program "Your Wonderful Town" is, in effect, a teacher of geography. Students know what is taught and how it is taught during their hours of formal classroom instruction. It is natural for them to compare that with what is presented on TV so interestingly and with the use of all the technological devices to impart knowledge. Effective instructors have always used wholesome showmanship in their teaching; now TV is demonstrating its efficacy.

Educational purposes cannot be achieved effectively unless the educator has regular, planned, and systematic access to a broadcasting channel — and this can mean only a non-commercial channel. Educators have demonstrated their awareness of their crucial responsibility in the development of these channels. They welcome the opportunity to demonstrate to the public that their academic skills can be translated into practical values. Their plans and aspirations promise to do this in a manner which is consistent with the philosophy, traditions, and practices of education in America. But it remains to be seen to what extent the familiar difficulties of cost and budget will curtail the achievement of educational TV.

## CHAPTER IV

### THE INDIVIDUAL, THE COMMUNITY, AND THE NATION

The modern world, having passed from crisis to crisis during this century, now faces a situation that seems to outweigh all the other crises. As in Matthew Arnold's poem:

The world, which seems  
To lie before us like a land of dreams,  
So various, so beautiful, so new  
Hath really neither joy, nor love, nor light,  
Nor certitude, nor peace, nor help for pain,  
And we are here as on a darkling plain  
Swept with confus'd alarms of struggle and flight,  
Where ignorant armies clash by night.

The awareness of community and the great privileges that our community life represents have become the key determinant of our survival. The vigor of this awareness more than anything else will define whether we live in a friendly world or in a world where survival means surrender of our freedoms. It will also determine whether we ourselves have sufficient faith in what we are and what we can become, to withstand enemies and make friends.

The individual has a need to belong; first, to a family group, then to a particular group such as religious or fraternal, next to his community group. The dictionary defines community as a joint ownership or joint participation which creates a community of interests. The basis of our American community is primarily our joint participation in an idea.

The community is a network of various associations. But it is also an entity which gives meaning to those component parts. It has been pointed out that there is an essential nature

in each community which is expressed in its social laws, its life, growth, decay, and immortality. The common life and the common interests of the people are the source of community. Within every community there are small neighborhoods with clusters of families whose children play together, go to school together, grow up together, and who sometimes marry. The parents are brought together by their schools and churches and other community groupings. They are united by a particular social philosophy which guides them in promoting the well-being and growth of their institutions.

Belonging to a community gives each individual a feeling of harmony, of participating, of being necessary to the whole. Community groups or associations organize; they maintain community chests, schools, parent and teacher organizations, clubs of various kinds. All of these associations mean that a group of people with a common purpose are working together to fulfill a social need. Community growth is a consequence of the activities of these local associations.

In recent studies made of social groupings, it has been observed that the person who does not belong, is not associated, does not have the same prestige in the community as the individual who does belong and who is associated. A community consists of many individuals who live and express themselves within many types of organized groupings. The level of their community experience depends upon the kind and quality of influence and interaction one group within the community has upon the others, and the action and relationships that result. It is important for the development of an American that he take an active part in the various activities of his particular community. These can range from the promotion of a town swimming pool to the organization of groups that discuss and attempt understanding of situations on the other side of the world.

Dr. Howard A. Rusk has directed attention to a significant example of how one community in New York City solved its

own problems. This is especially interesting because social scientists tell us that neighborhoods tend to disintegrate in metropolitan centers. In his column in the New York Times, Dr. Rusk tells us:\*

This is a report of a community within a community which has been helping itself during the last ten years in a unique social experiment. It is the story of how the Washington Heights-Riverside District Health Committee of upper West Side New York has, in the impersonal and highly complex atmosphere of a big city, developed a community-wide interest in, and responsibility for, its own health.

Dr. Rusk continues with the story of seven natural neighborhoods (each of which is the size of an average American town), getting together a committee made up of business men, housewives, and professional people. They spent their first few years laying the groundwork for citizen participation because they knew it was on this factor their success depended. They talked with organized groups associated with schools, colleges, art and music centers, churches, hospitals and libraries. As their work progressed, specific problems came to the foreground. One culminated in an all-out drive on venereal disease in 1946. Another program focused on rodent control and sanitation; another project on chest X-rays for tuberculosis detection; attention has also been centered on the diverse problems of older people of the neighborhood, and mental and school health.

The marked success of this community program has particular significance since it demonstrates that a "grass roots" program is possible even in a large city. It illustrates that whether one works in the face of the difficulties presented by a large metropolitan area or works within a rural community, the link between problems and action upon them lies in the hands of the citizens of those communities. This experience has also caused recognition of the fact that it is only through such joint

---

\* May 18, 1952

planning and cooperation that our problems can be solved, certainly our domestic problems, and the foundations laid in this way for real international understanding.

The necessity for positive action is as great in any other American community as it is in the New York City upper West Side example, just cited. Take your daily paper and read a few of the headings. "A Somber Report" — annual bulletin of J. Edgar Hoover, reporting an increase in crime throughout the United States of 5.1 percent in 1951. "Ives Cites Perils in Public Apathy . . . Senator Urges YMCA to lead Movement to Get People to Accept Responsibilities." The Senator feels the greatest problem this country faces is the breakdown of government and that the cause of the collapse is failure of the people to accept their civic responsibilities. He decries the decadence threatening the American people and urges a national movement to combat it. "U.N. Global Survey shows Need for More Food, Housing, Education." A new global survey appraising living conditions affecting 2,400,000,000 human beings emphasized increased population in under-developed areas. There was less production of food and general poverty of small-scale farmers in these countries. The UN delegates hoped it would illustrate the problems for which they seek help and technical assistance. The report made no formal recommendations but pointed up the growing recognition of more prosperous states that the impoverishment of "any" area is a concern to "all areas".

Each one of these news reports represents a problem. Whether like the last, on a global level, or like the others, on a national or local level — they are problems of community. They represent material for study and action. If they seem to show the interest of only a few and the folly of many, they actually reflect, as if held before a mirror, the picture of our contemporary living. The purposes and laws of the community are empty unless they are given validity by the will of men. Only the dy-

dynamic will of individuals can bring about change, can create, has the determination to fill the frame of community with a meaningful and serviceable picture.

It behooves communities all over the country, then, to collaborate in programs that meet community needs. With television available for use, communities have the opportunity better to avail themselves of whatever strength they possess. Now everyone can be reached and in terms that he can understand. The community television station will have to make it part of its business to know and understand the audience it must reach. Programs can be levelled at every particular audience and the smaller groups will not be sacrificed to the "mass" audience programs. Community problems could be explained; everyone in the community could be invited to contribute his share toward their solution.

If our citizens demonstrate a lack of sufficient interest in vital issues, is it not high time that positive action was taken to meet the situation? All the evils reported by the newspapers reflect community failure to provide adequate social safeguards. Members of each community must learn to regard crime, inadequate housing, and juvenile delinquency as problems created by the community and which must be solved by the community. It is worth noting that so-called "gangs" or criminal groups evolve on a community neighborhood basis, as an anti-social index rather than as part of a healthy social development.

Until very recently, relatively few have had a sense of participating in and contributing to the enterprises of citizenship upon which democratic society rests. For example, we are shocked to learn that less than half of those eligible to vote exercised their suffrage in the 1948 Presidential election.

Few are aware of the scientific and social organization upon which their very existence depends. Take, as an example, the transportation of food to any large metropolitan center. How much does the average man know of this almost incredibly

intricate enterprise upon which his sustenance depends? Yet that illustration indicates how much the well-being of a single community is dependent upon seemingly unrelated developments throughout our country. But we are learning to our cost that our fate can be determined far from our national borders — even in the significance of a geographical expression called the 38th Parallel.

The safeguarding of this nation's security cannot be left only to the men in uniform. It is the business of every citizen. And if citizens are to understand vital issues, if they are to increase their own knowledge so they may formulate their own thoughts and opinions, if they are to understand the spiritual and the economic and human factors in the present struggle against Communism, methods of communication equal to the needs of our time must be developed. TV is uniquely suited for this purpose.

The most complete type of community is the nation, which creates the state; within the state there are communities with their local governments, towns, districts. The local communities create their associations to uphold community interests. A community is a collection of individuals, living in the same place under the same conditions. According to this concept, we can begin with the first statement of this paragraph to form a circle, and adding the next two sentences we will complete the circle. Or, using a reverse order, we have first the individual and his associations; the community; local governments of towns and districts; ultimately, the state; finally, the nation. Either way, the individual is both the beginning and the end. This is the fundamental lesson essential to a true appreciation of democracy.

Karl Mannheim has offered this explanation of the basis of community:

We belong to a group not only because we are born into it, not merely because we profess to belong to it, nor finally be-

cause we give it our loyalty and allegiance, but primarily because we see the world and certain things in the world the way it does (i.e., in terms of the meanings of the group in question).\*

To apply this idea to the American community, one could say that we are Americans not merely because we were born in America, not merely because we call ourselves Americans, nor even because we profess loyalty and swear allegiance, but because we see the world in terms of an idea: a composite of Washington and Lincoln; the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights; Emerson, Whitman, and Ernie Pyle; Valley Forge and Iwo Jima.

In the last analysis this composite, this American Idea, constitutes our surest protection. Human beings live by ideas. This idea should be America's most important export — the social credo, the recognition of the individual, which is expressed in our Declaration of Independence and our Bill of Rights. We should enable the world to understand that the way of life for which Thoreau strove is our own national ideal:

So to love wisdom as to live according to its dictates, a life of simplicity, independence, magnanimity and trust . . . to solve some of the problems of life not only theoretically but practically.

It is no exaggeration that most of us are only dimly aware of the meaning of the American way — the American Idea. That may account for the apathy with which the American public has or has not responded to vital public issues, its startling lack of activity in the national polls. It may even account for the serious lapses in political morality which have shocked us. Can your neighbor satisfactorily explain what it means to be an American and to live in our democracy?

At a recent public hearing, a witness was asked what he had done to express his value of his American citizenship. He answered: "I paid my taxes". This conception of good cit-

---

\* Ideology and Utopia. New York, Harcourt Brace, 1949. p. 19

izenship is as inadequate as a woman's idea of being a good mother because she washed her child's clothes. It is all right as far as it goes, but in both cases, the conception of value is only a fraction of the whole.

We desperately need a statement, a re-statement, and again a re-statement of the principles and history which have made America great. Every child and every adult in this country should be as familiar with these principles and this history as he is (or should be) familiar with the National Anthem.

Higher and higher taxes, inflation, corruption in government, a frustrating war being fought in Korea have all added to the general confusion and the feeling of futility of our society. Parents of families who would like to establish security for their children and for their own comfort in their last years, find one goal alone almost impossible to achieve now. Teenagers, facing the certainty of army service to fight a war that apparently is destined to go on indefinitely, face life with a feeling of desperation and futility. Our society finds alarming numbers of its young people turning to narcotics. We find traditional beliefs crumbling. We face skepticism and eventually panic.

The President of Yale University, A. Whitney Griswold, recently stated:

. . . (Our) country . . . by tradition and temperament looks to the individual for the salvation of the race . . . We do not know our strength; and we do not know our strength because we do not know our history . . .

If it is possible to create again the national unity that we have exhibited in earlier crisis in our history, we will be strong enough to confront any challenge. But that unity depends upon the awareness of our society of the principles which created it and upon which it must depend for survival. This awareness must reach into all phases of our national activity and living.

We have overlooked the role TV can and must play in our present crisis. Television has been developed at a time when a great force is needed to rise above and transcend the contemporary perplexities. Facing the difficulties that have come with our rapid technological development, it would seem only sensible to use one of the greatest of these developments to help us out of our difficulties.

As Norbert Weiner\* has pointed out: "To live effectively is to live with adequate information." He argues that information is a measure of order and that in a closed system it tends to decrease. An anecdote told by Wendell Willkie about the Maginot Line illustrates this point. A thoughtful citizen of France once suggested that modern warfare could easily destroy fortresses built underground and in no time nullify the alleged protection of this Line. He was told that such matters are best handled by the experts.

We in this country need to understand our common purposes. The basic requirement for progress is freedom — freedom to inquire, to think, to try, to exchange thoughts and ideas. When an individual operates in an atmosphere of freedom, all things are possible. Freedom is the Open Sesame — the magic word that frees the greatest genius on earth. Freedom makes possible the unending development of the human being.

It is plain that to overcome our present crisis successfully, every individual in the nation needs to take his share of the responsibility. We must know what the people all over the world aim for, we must try to understand their point of view, and we must let them know our principles and our aims. Public opinion is a powerful factor in every country of the world; it is expressed in the tea shops of China and India; in the coffee-houses of Bagdad. When Russians meet and talk, they exchange opinions regardless of "Iron Curtain" regulations. The exist-

---

\* The Human Use of Human Beings. Boston, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1950. p. 124

ence of the underground, in Facist and Communist controlled countries, is in itself proof of the forceful activation public opinion can take.

The great goal of our foreign policy should be to create among Europeans and Asiatics the belief that they share with us a community of interests. It can be said that our community of interest is with the people of the world. In every country there is worry and doubt in the hearts and minds of people. How could it be otherwise when, whether torn in revolution or other conflict, the world today is one community and what effects one nation must effect all others? The better life to which people all over the world aspire is the basis of the American Idea, not only for America but for the world. The Marshall Plan and Point 4 are the very antithesis of the imperialism and domestic reaction against which the nationalist movements of the world are in revolt.

What was once the "colonial world" — India, Pakistan, Korea — has undergone significant changes in recent years. They are examples of the changing political face of Asia. As Queen Wilhelmina said: "The age of colonialism is dead". Independent states are emerging from the "colonial world". They have become independent through various means and through various causes. They should be our friends and our allies. They face a threat, too: a threat to their independence and their freedom, the same threat that Communist imperialism and dictatorship holds for us. The valiant struggle of these new states for their independence, their right to freedom of thought and action, seems like an echo, nearly two hundred years later, of the American struggle.

Time and history have brought us new lessons, all bitterly learned. But the fundamental we learned in our very first conflict never changes: we enjoy freedom; we must still defend it. The American flag can have no substitute. For us its meaning is transcendent and absolute.

## CHAPTER V

### THROUGH A GLASS, DARKLY

The Federal Communications Commission announced its final allocation of TV channels on April 14, 1952 with its Sixth Report and Order. In that report it reserved 242 channels throughout the nation for the use of educational broadcasters. The Joint Committee for Educational Television and other educators have highly praised the FCC for this far-sighted action in behalf of the national community. Ralph Steetle, Executive Director of the JCET, declared that the Commission deserved the gratitude of the American people, that the decision was truly in the public interest. He expressed confidence that many educational agencies would immediately take steps to construct and operate television stations.

It is important, however, to understand better the provisions and the limitations of the Sixth Report. Every educator and every citizen should be intimately familiar with this decision which constitutes a landmark in the educational history of our country. Commissioner Frieda B. Hennock concurred in the Sixth Report insofar as it adopted the principle of reserving channels for educational purposes and assigned specific channels for such purposes, but dissented insofar as it failed "to make a more adequate and proper provision for education herein". In her dissenting opinion, Commissioner Hennock offers the most illuminating discussion of these limitations from an educational point of view.\* A brief summary of her Dissent is given in the following paragraphs.

---

\* The full text of Commissioner Hennock's Partial Dissent to the Sixth Order is given in Appendix A.

Referring to the many successful experiments in teaching through TV, she states that "they provide increasing proof that television, in the hands of educators, could revitalize and expand our entire educational system and do so at a minimum cost". Commercial stations cannot provide, nor in all fairness could they be expected to provide, a complete educational service. Only a system of independently licensed educational stations operating full-time on a non-commercial basis can accomplish a truly beneficial, educational, public service. There is no doubt that the television spectrum should be devoted principally to commercial operations, which is the traditional concept of our broadcasting system. Non-commercial television can never fulfill the vital function which commercial broadcasting plays.

The Commission's scale of relative values, upon which its assignments are based, have undervalued education. They have placed it in a strikingly subordinate position by not providing it with a proportionate share of the channels. Commercial broadcasting has received the "lion's" share and the "lamb's" share as well. The evidence introduced by educators is conclusive of their deep interest in TV, and their plans are not visionary, but based on concrete facts and figures.

In examining their Table of Assignments itself, it is felt that the Commission's provision for educational TV is generally inadequate. It fails to reserve sufficient channels for nationwide educational service. There were 233 reservations finalized by the Commission, representing approximately 11.6% of the total number of assignments. It is held that such a distribution of channels provides only for haphazard and inequitable development. For example, with no allocation in about one-fourth of all of the metropolitan communities of the country, an area as large as Allentown-Bethlehem (Penn.), with a population of 430,000, is scheduled to be deprived for all time of educational services, which comparable or even smaller communities may soon enjoy.

The Commission has improperly bound its policy of reservations too closely to a showing of present demand by educators. The public interest would have required the Commission to make substantial reservations in this allocations proceeding, EVEN IF educators had made no formal showing of any kind on this record. America's unique system of free public schools did not have an instantaneous and simultaneous development in all parts of the United States.

The Commission in its allocations improperly fails to distinguish between educational and commercial assignments. There is an essential distinction between the educational and commercial television services, and they must be treated differently. A channel for education does not merely bring another TV station to a community. It is designed to provide a separate and definite kind of service to it. Hence, a city already served by commercial stations could be entitled to an assignment for education even though, on comparative factors, no additional assignment for commercial purposes could be permitted to it.

This decision will in general exclude education from the unassigned portion of the TV spectrum, the "flexibility" channels. Channels 66 to 83, established as a pool of unassigned channels known as the "flexibility" band, represent more than 20% of the entire television spectrum. The Commission has provided a total of only fourteen assignments for education in them and even this small number has been set aside only on specific demand of educators in the cities affected.

It is essential that the Commission provide for this new educational service by not hampering it with too many restrictions. Cities usually hold authority over the public school system and it would be contradictory and incongruous if the school system, a subordinate to the municipal system, should be found to be eligible for license while the city itself is not. In many instances, the municipality could more efficiently operate the station.

Other Dissents from the Order by Commissioners Robert F. Jones and Edward M. Webster were on the ground that it discriminated against the rural population in favor of the larger cities.

The resourcefulness of the Western world in developing new techniques of communication has now more than ever given men the opportunity to convey and exchange information accurately, — to diffuse education which can transform every community even in remote areas. These techniques of communication can create the wonderful changes that follow when literacy replaces illiteracy. J. Z. Young\* states:

Whether we like it or not, we can be sure that societies that use to the full new techniques of communication, by better language and by better machines, will eventually replace those that do not.

The network of communication, intranational and international, that the world has developed today represents a degree of completeness never before equalled in history. Yet in contradiction to this foundation for understanding, there exists the alarming proportion of misinformation, misunderstanding, and distrust that most of us know about, representing practically a phenomenon of misunderstanding.

One hears suggestions for plans of international communication via TV. Few areas could present more complex problems than this one because every communication problem intimately reaches into problems in many other fields.\*\* Some day there will undoubtedly be global television, but at present television can serve the cause of international understanding for

---

\* J. Z. Young. *Doubt and Certainty in Science*. London, Oxford University Press, 1951. p. 7

\*\* "Any development and improvement in communications will inevitably influence political, economic, social and educational conditions, a fact which should be carefully considered in planning such projects." Huth, Arno. *Communications and Economic Development*. International Conciliation, January, 1952

all essential purposes. This can be done through the exchange of films showing the cultures, traditions, and points of view of different lands. Shipping the films by airplane across oceans will not detract from their content, and there will be the difference of only a few days in their being televised, at their point of destination.

The administration of our TV system is closely observed and judged all over the world. European discussion as a reflection of what Americanism means, too frequently and unfairly derogates us in the eyes of those whose friendship we need. For example, Dr. Kurt Schenker, Director of Radio Berne, expressed his highly biased opinion of American TV in "The Bund", a leading newspaper in the Swiss Capital. According to Schenker, the development of television in America is without quality, has hollow standards, and is based entirely on commercial speculation. It is like narcotics, and the whole family takes it. If such television were introduced in Switzerland, unrest would spread and the Swiss would have the bad experience with their children that Americans are alleged to have.

In the debate in the House of Commons on the future of broadcasting, Home Secretary Sir David Maxwell Fyfe said the British were "much more mature and sophisticated people than those of the United States" and would resolve the problems of taste in their own British way. Herbert Morrison cited a recent United States report of programs heavily weighted with crime, violence, and gunplay in commercial television programs for children. He argued that such competitive commercial TV is "totally against the British way of life and the best British traditions". Beverly Baxter said his sympathies were with Mr. Morrison's viewpoint and that United States television programs he had seen practised "terrorism by suggestion. The American girl was supposed to be the quintessence of feminine charm but, according to television advertisers, she suffered from dandruff, body odor and halitosis."\*

---

\* New York Times, June 12, 1952

It is not necessary to point out the unfairness and inaccuracy of the statements which have been quoted. We simply cannot afford to overlook the fact that our television programs are studied abroad with the closest attention.

The chairman of our FCC, Mr. Paul Walker, has indicated the great contribution that TV can make toward the eradication of illiteracy. He has estimated that the one hundred and twenty-one million dollar investment which would cover the cost of construction of all of the two hundred and forty-two educational stations could be recovered if the activity of these stations raised the annual income of only one-eighth of our ten million illiterates by \$100 per capita. He has said that lifting these people from illiteracy to literacy would make them more valuable to industry and better consumers.

Commissioner Walker's statement is of value as showing how educational television might pay for itself by raising the productivity and earning capacity of illiterates. But there is no doubt that our literate citizens as well as our illiterate ones may be made more productive by better education. If a rise in the earning capacity of illiterates would pay for educational television, then the improvement in productivity of our literate citizens would make it possible for educational television to pay for itself several times over.

What is the perspective of the future? There is little doubt that from now on popular attitudes and behavior will be more decisively determined by what people look at than by what they read. The great challenge facing television is to recover for society a sense of community and to convey that sense of community through television programs that flow into and out of each community in the country. Ideas and meaningful experiences that have value to each community can find expression and be exchanged. Thus there can be created and kept constantly alive an atmosphere of fresh thought that is stimulating and conducive to creativity. In the last analysis, the challenge facing

television lies in communicating programs with an aesthetic integrity that conforms to their profound content, and which also provide intelligent grounds for behavior.

Today, as the era of print undergoes a basic transformation, as a new art form emerges, it is good to be reminded of Wordsworth's celebrated Preface written one hundred and fifty years ago:

For the human mind is capable of being excited without the application of gross and violent stimulants; and he must have a very faint perception of its beauty and dignity who does not know this. In spite of differences of soil and climate, of language and manner, of laws and customs; in spite of things silently gone out of mind and things violently destroyed, the poet binds together by passion and knowledge the vast empire of human society, as it is spread over the whole earth and over all time.

There are those thinkers who have said that we have the means to realize democracy's ideals through the most far-reaching system of education that has ever been devised. One could go further and say that our future as a nation depends on how we make use of this system for education.

Now we see through a glass, darkly. But everyone of us has a psalm, a doctrine, a revelation, an interpretation, a tongue. Let us hear all the voices!

## APPENDIX A

The Dissent of Commissioner Frieda B. Hennock from the Federal Communications Commission's Sixth Report and Order.

### I

I am in complete agreement with the Commission's action in finally adopting the principle of indefinitely reserving television channels for noncommercial educational purposes. I concur, therefore, in the Commission's decision insofar as it has finally reserved specific channels in cities throughout the United States. Both Commission recognition of the principle and the specific reservations mark a significant step forward for educational-TV. I believe, however, that the Commission's provision for education herein is deficient in many vital respects, both general and specific. By failing to provide education with its rightful share of the television spectrum, the Commission, in my opinion, runs the risk of stunting the growth of educational-TV in the formative days of its infancy and of forever retarding the future of our entire educational system.

My Separate Views to the Commission's Third Notice, issued March 21, 1951, pointed out certain defects in the proposals therein respecting educational television in the hope that they would be remedied before final action was taken. Our decision today, however, in large measures finalizes these proposals and thus freezes into permanency most of the flaws and shortcomings contained in them. Furthermore, their adoption has resulted in numerous errors in the specific allocations of the Commission's Table of Assignments. In view of the finality of this action, the additional evidence adduced by educators in the city-by-city hearings and the constantly increasing advancements in educational-TV, I now feel even more certain that the Commission has grievously erred in not providing education with the reservations it needs and deserves and that, in so doing, it has worked an injustice to the public interest.

## II

In order to give a proper perspective to the Commission's action, certain background facts should first be stated in summary form. It is fundamental that the Commission is herein shaping the nature and course of television operations for generations to come. In this decision, the Commission allocates and opens up for licensing almost all of the frequencies that now remain available for television service. Education in general will not immediately be able to claim and use these television channels; it will need, as the Commission recognizes, additional time in which to secure funds, evolve organizational structures and, just as important, investigate and develop the new, expanded role which it can, through television, play in the community.

In view of the pent-up commercial demand for television facilities and the certainty of their early preemption for regular commercial operations, only the reservation now of a substantial number of channels will insure their availability for future, full-scale educational use. Provision for education in television must literally be made now or never. Since education cannot in the immediate future compete for the remaining channels, the absence of a reservation in any city is almost a death blow to its opportunity for an educational-television service.

## III

There has been no question as to the tremendous potential inherent in large-scale use of television by educators. TV, as the "electronic blackboard," is a teaching tool of rare power and persuasion. Combining sight and sound, blessed with an immediacy of transmission and impact, welcomed by and available to almost everyone, television offers an unprecedented opportunity for education, both formal and informal. It is uniquely capable of serving all of our people in our schools, homes and factories on a constant and intimate basis. It can do so, moreover, at a cost which is extraordinarily low when full account is taken of its effectiveness and extensive coverage.

To refer to educational-TV, however, is no longer to speak merely of a potential, however, basic such considerations might be. The steadily expanding volume of educational telecasting and the many successful experiments in teaching through TV are already realizing the potential of this new medium in every day life. These activities show only a sample of what education could do with its own full-time stations; they provide increasing proof that television, in the hands of

educators, could revitalize and expand our entire educational system and do so at a minimum cost.

#### IV

The phenomenon of television has had an unprecedentedly rapid growth; it has become in only six years an integral part of the lives and habits of millions of people. Already possessing major standing among the mass media, its power and influence will without question soon be second to none. It is particularly irresistible to children, tens of thousands of whom already spend more time before their TV receivers than they do in school.

Television, like other technical innovations, is neutral in character; its use (or rather, our use of it) will ultimately determine its value. In view of television's extraordinary influence, which must grow rather than abate in future years, the Commission has an especial responsibility to the public—adults as well as children—to insure that this great natural resource to a substantial degree is devoted to cultural interests, to education as well as entertainment. The Commission's lawful task is not merely to establish the technical framework for television service. The public must not only be reached, it must (in the truly beneficial sense of that word) be "served". The Commission's goal, within the ambit of its statutory powers, should therefore be to bring about the best possible television service for the American people. The participation of educators on a full-scale basis is indispensable to its achievement.

#### V

It is clear from the record in these proceedings, as it is from the entire history of broadcasting, that educational stations can and will make a distinctive and valuable contribution to television. Although there are commercial stations which, as part of their public service responsibilities, have granted time and facilities for educational telecasting, these programs at best do not even begin to satisfy education's need in television. Commercial stations in general cannot provide, nor in all fairness could they be expected to provide, a complete educational service. Only a system of independently licensed educational stations operating full-time on a noncommercial basis can accomplish such a service.

Educational-TV stations, when established, will do more than

furnish a uniquely valuable teaching aid for in-school and home use. They will supply a beneficial complement to commercial telecasting. Providing for a greater diversity in TV programming, they will be particularly attractive to the many specialized and minority interests in the community, cultural as well as educational, which tend to be bypassed by commercial broadcasters thinking in terms of mass audiences. They will permit the entire viewing public an unaccustomed freedom of choice in programming. Educationally licensed and operated stations will, in addition, result in substantial and beneficial diversification in the ownership and control of broadcast facilities. This would be closely in line with established Commission policy which has sought to achieve such diversification through the exercise of its licensing authority. Finally, educational stations will provide the highest standards of public service. Introducing non-commercial objectives and activities, they will be a leavening agent raising the aim and operations of our entire broadcasting system.

## VI

The Commission's mandate, in these circumstances, requires it to provide a thoroughgoing opportunity for education in television, to grant educators an *adequate* "home in the spectrum." It can do so only by maximizing the number of reservations for education and by realistically implementing its action here and in its Rules and Regulations so as to encourage and enable educators to take full advantage of these reservations. By "maximizing the number of reservations," I mean the necessity of giving education one of the *paramount* priorities in the allocation of channels and of reserving as many assignments as possible, consistent with the other *major* needs in the spectrum. Certainly the Commission has not adopted or applied such a policy here.

There can be no doubt that the television spectrum in the main should be devoted to commercial operations in accordance with the traditional concepts of our broadcasting system. Commercial broadcasting plays a vital function in the development and operation of this system, one which the non-commercial cannot fulfill. Educational television has, however, its own uniquely valuable contribution of public service to make to this system. Thus, only by establishing a high ranking educational priority could the Commission meet its obligation, inherent in the Communications Act and expressly recognized in its 1935 Report to Congress respecting Section 307 (c) of that Act, to "actively assist

in the determination of the rightful place of broadcasting in education and to see that it is used in that place.”

In establishing a scale of relative values, upon which its allocations and assignments are based, the Commission has sorely undervalued education and placed it in a grossly subordinate position. As a result of the Commission's failure to strike a proper balance of the various interests here involved, education has not been provided with the proportionate share of the channels it deserves. Certainly commercial broadcasting should get the “lion's” share of these TV frequencies; it should not, however, get the “lamb's” share as well.

## VII

The evidence of educators' deep interest in television and the steps they have already taken or contemplate as to the building and operation of TV stations is detailed, voluminous and persuasive. Educators' affidavits have, in scores of instances, gone far beyond expressions of mere willingness or hope. They have set forth concrete facts and figures; they have particularized in minute degree the why's and how's of their plans for educational television. Merely to glance through them—to mention only the affidavits of the New York State Board of Regents, the New Jersey Board of Education, the Wisconsin State Radio Council, the Universities of Kansas, Houston, Ohio State and Southern Illinois, of educators in the cities of Milwaukee, Houston, Pittsburgh, Chicago, San Francisco, Boston, etc.—establishes conclusively that education, given a proper reservation, will make excellent use of the facilities set aside for it.

The Commission holds herein that the entire record in the general portion of the proceedings overcomes objections to the basic principle of reservations. In the same way, the entire record in these proceedings, particularly the evidence in the city-by-city hearings, should be held to overcome any and all objections to finalizing specific reservations herein. Cumulatively, this entire record supports a maximum number of reservations sufficient for a nationwide service, which would allow almost everyone in this country to enjoy the benefits of an educational “school of the air.” At the very least, this record requires that the Commission finalize all of the reservations proposed in the Third Notice and grant, in the absence of more basic considerations to the contrary, those other reservations specifically requested by educators herein.

## VIII

With the foregoing remarks to serve as background, we may now turn to an examination of the Table of Assignments itself. In my opinion, the Commission's provision for educational-TV is *generally* inadequate in that:

a. *It fails to reserve sufficient channels for a nationwide educational service.*—Since reservations for all practical purposes are indispensable to the establishment of educational television stations, it is axiomatic that only a policy of setting aside channels on a nationwide basis will accomplish the development of a truly national educational service. Yet, the 233 reservations finalized by the Commission, representing approximately 11.6% of the total number of assignments, fall woefully short of providing the requisite number of channels for such a service. They allow at best for haphazard and inequitable educational development of the medium.

There is no allocation for educational-TV in approximately *one-fourth of all of the metropolitan communities* in this country. This includes cities as large as Youngstown (Ohio) with a metropolitan area population of 525,000; Allentown-Bethlehem (Pennsylvania) with a population of 430,000; and Springfield-Holyoke (Massachusetts) with a population of 400,000. The people in these many large cities, therefore, will probably be deprived for all time of a valuable educational service which their more fortunate neighbors in comparable or smaller communities may soon enjoy.

Similarly, there is only a single reservation provided for each of the following states: Massachusetts, Maryland, Kentucky, Wyoming, Delaware, Rhode Island and Vermont, out of a combined total of 114 channels assigned to them. Only two reservations have been provided for the entire states of Minnesota, Nebraska, Arizona, Idaho, Nevada and New Hampshire. In New York City where scores of educational and cultural institutions serve more than 11,000,000 people in the area, only one channel has been reserved despite the forcefully documented request of the New York State Board of Regents for a second channel to meet the combined needs of the Regents, the City itself, the Board of Education and the many private schools and institutions of higher learning located there. This is done despite the fact that New York City is today the primary production center for commercial television and its many writers, artists and technicians would likewise be of great value to educational television.

b. *The reservations have predominantly been confined to the ultra-high (UHF) portion of the spectrum and an insufficient number of VHF reservations provided:* By limiting education to UHF frequencies in cities in which commercial television over VHF has already made substantial inroads, or will soon do so, the Commission has placed the educators there at a fundamental disadvantage. This situation exists in a large number of cities, including such major communities as Detroit, Philadelphia, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Washington, etc. While it may be true that some educators in these circumstances will find UHF operations only a "temporary handicap", for others it may prove to be a permanent disability. The public's stake in educational-TV is too great to be forced to rest on such speculation.

The past year since issuance of the Third Notice has further aggravated this problem, and made even clearer the inadvisability of forcing education into the UHF in these cities. More than 16 million TV receivers are now in the hands of the public and, in many communities set ownership nears or stands at the "saturation point." Educators undertaking the task, considerable in itself, of raising funds for non-commercial operations will be faced with the difficult obstacle that their UHF operations in these cities would not be capable of being received by a single one of the millions of outstanding sets, unless these sets are first converted.

No one can be unmindful of the fact that commercial operators attempting UHF telecasting in cities with established VHF service will themselves be handicapped by an initial competitive disadvantage. But, however great this problem of integrating UHF into existing VHF operations may be, it can best be handled by commercial operators who are spurred on by competitive motives and possible monetary profits and it properly should be entrusted to them. For the Commission to force education to carry what is essentially a substantial commercial burden is unrealistic and unwise, for it appreciably limits the opportunity a reservation offers to educators.

Education's share of the VHF is clearly inadequate. Not a single VHF reservation has been provided for the states of New York, Michigan, Ohio, Indiana, Connecticut, New Jersey, Virginia, West Virginia, Nebraska, Kentucky, Rhode Island, Delaware, Vermont, and Maryland, out of a combined total of 97 VHF channels assigned to them. Only a single VHF has been reserved in each of the following states: Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, Missouri, North Carolina, New

Hampshire, Maine, Mississippi, Nevada, South Carolina, Utah, Idaho, Wyoming and Louisiana, out of a combined total of 136 VHF assigned to them. Thus, *in 28 states*, including many of the leaders in population and resources which have particular need for educational television, *educators have received fourteen VHF out of a total of 233 assigned.*

In order to correct this inequitable distribution of channels to education, the Commission should have, whenever possible, placed in the VHF the additional reservations allocated herein and should have made particular effort to provide a VHF reservation in the "closed" and predominantly VHF cities.

*c. The Commission has improperly bound its policy of reservations too closely to a showing of present demand by educators.*— A study of the specific assignments herein clearly establishes that the Commission has refused to extend its reservations to the cities necessary for a nationwide educational service *solely for the reason that no showing of demand for such reservations has been made by local educators* in these cities. On the same basis the Commission in several cities has deleted proposed VHF reservations. Only in cases where a proposed reservation has not been opposed by commercial interests has the Commission finalized reservations, whether VHF or UHF, without requiring evidence of educational demand. In all other instances educators have supported the proposed reservations in their respective cities.

Reservations are too critically needed, however, to be made to depend on showings of present demand. That local educators in each and every city affected have not, at this premature date in the early history of TV, given formal assurances of their intention and ability to make use of the medium, should not be material here. In this crucial area of public welfare, the Commission must not rely solely upon the self-interest and awareness of present-day educators to delineate and prescribe future educational needs in television. The public interest, in my opinion, would have required the Commission to make substantial reservations in this allocations proceeding, *even if* educators had made no formal showing of any kind on this record.

As amply shown on the record and spelled out by the Commission herein, the fact that many local educators in specific localities are not now ready to claim frequencies is a basic reason for the very principle of reservations and precisely because of it have channels now been set aside for future educational use. It is therefore grossly inconsistent and incongruous to hold present educational demand to be un-

necessary in determining the general principle requiring reservations, and then to make it an essential in the city-by-city hearings concerning specific reservations.

If the Commission is, however, to require a showing of educational demand, despite the above objections to such a policy, it would be much more valid for it here to point to and rely on the great quantum of evidence from educational institutions and communities that are now ready, willing and, in some cases, even able to begin full-time television operations as the basis for a more liberal policy towards education. It is to those eminent educators who have taken the lead in TV that we should look, if we must, to determine what in general may be expected from education in years to come. Uniformity of opinion and action from every community in the nation is simply too much to expect. That it has not been manifested is in no way proof of any permanent lack of interest by less advanced or smaller schools or any fixed inability on their part to undertake singly or cooperatively, the operation of their own non-commercial stations. It is solely and simply due to the fact that in educational television, as elsewhere, some must lead so that others may follow.

The very purpose of an allocations plan and the Table of Assignments is to erect a bulwark to protect TV's development against the inroads of present demand. This purpose should apply consistently to both educational and commercial allocations, and neither the reservations nor commercial assignments to the smaller cities should be limited by the fact that identifiable persons or groups have failed to articulate formally a determination and ability to use the facility. The future rights of the commercial and educational interests that are not yet sufficiently vocal to appear in these proceedings are precisely those which the Commission has the primary duty to protect.

An overall national allocations plan for the distribution of all television channels in the public interest must not be grounded predominantly upon considerations of immediate demand. This is true even where, as here, such demand may be expressed in the form of affidavits rather than as applications for construction permits. In establishing the structure and nature of our future television system, the Commission must look beyond contemporary opinions and attitudes that patently are underdeveloped and which assuredly will change with time and circumstance. To do otherwise is to tie the future with the bonds of the past.

d. *The Commission in its allocations improperly fails to distinguish between educational and commercial assignments.*—The Commission in acting upon the assignments for specific cities has considered education merely as one of the television services to be provided for a given community. It has failed in every case to recognize the essential distinction between the educational and commercial television service which calls for their different treatment. The function, scope and mode of operation of educational television differ markedly from those of commercial telecasting. An assignment for education is not designed solely to bring another TV station to a community, but to provide a separate and unique service to it, permitting fuller expression of its educational and cultural interests. In keeping with this distinction a city already served by commercial stations may be entitled to an assignment for education even though, on comparative factors, no additional assignment for commercial purposes could be permitted to it. This is vital in specific assignments for such cities as Detroit and Columbus, hereinafter discussed.

The Commission has heretofore recognized the difference between the educational and commercial services. In FM it has set aside a separate block of channels exclusively and entirely for non-commercial educational stations. The only reason for not utilizing this method of "block reservations" in television, as expressly stated in the Commission's Third Notice, was in order to achieve greater efficiency of allocations throughout the entire Table of Assignments. That the Commission now chooses in TV to proceed by reserving specific channels in individual cities should not, however, cause it to lose sight of the essential fact that education is a completely separate and distinct service and should be so treated.

e. *This decision will in general exclude education from the unassigned portion of the TV spectrum, the "flexibility" channels.*—The Commission has, as hereinbefore stated, established channels 66 to 83 as a pool of unassigned channels, known in the Third Notice as the "flexibility" band. Although these unassigned channels represent more than 20% of the entire television spectrum, the Commission has provided a total of only *fourteen* assignments for education in them. Even this small number has been set aside solely upon specific demand by educators in the cities affected.

By making these unassigned channels available (after one year) on a demand basis to any party instituting proper rule making pro-

ceedings, the Commission has severely limited educators' opportunity to secure any further assignments in them. The Commission's statement herein that these unassigned channels will "primarily" be used for communities without educational (and commercial) assignments does not afford an adequate protection to educators, since no specific standards have been provided to effectuate this intention. In light of the Commission's own acknowledgments that educators need a longer time to enter television, it is impossible to attach substantial significance to the provision herein permitting educators to file for an unassigned channel *even during* the coming year when most proposed amendments to the Table will not be accepted. A one-year preference to these unassigned channels is as illusory as would be a one-year reservation.

The Commission's provision for "flexibility" channels, particularly insofar as education is concerned, is therefore completely inconsistent with the fundamental principles followed by it with respect to channels 2 through 65. *To be consistent and equitable, the Commission must establish a firm principle under which education would have a preference in "flexibility" channels equivalent to its reservations in the other channels.* This preference could be accomplished by a rule of "limited eligibility," such as spelled out hereinbefore for smaller communities without television assignments. (Part B of this Opinion). In other words, I would retain the proposal concerning "flexibility" channels contained in the Third Notice and extend it to include cities without educational assignments, instead of almost completely deleting that proposal as the Commission has done in this Report.

f. *Eligibility for the licensing of non-commercial stations has been unduly limited.*—I believe that municipalities should be made eligible in every instance to operate stations on reserved non-commercial channels. To limit eligibility in general to educational institutions is, in my opinion, unnecessarily strict, for in many instances it may prevent the most efficient administration of the licensed channel and may even result in the complete loss of an otherwise ready and valuable licensee.

In providing for this new and unique educational service, the Commission should not be unduly restrictive of its future development. Television is so much more costly than aural broadcasting and involves such substantial differences in organization and operation, that practices followed in FM should not necessarily be binding here. As the city usually holds authority over the public school system, it is not only incongruous but it contradicts the basic principle of licensee re-

sponsibility to provide that its subordinate entity is eligible for license while the city itself is not. Moreover, in many instances the municipality could more efficiently operate the station, particularly so when it has jurisdiction over the many and varied educational and cultural institutions in the city.

It is clear that every licensee of a reserved channel will be required to broadcast exclusively on a non-commercial basis, featuring specialized educational and cultural programming, and will be bound by the general requirements for cooperative arrangements among all educational institutions in the area. In view of these careful limitations as to the nature and scope of educational-TV operations, I can see no reason why the Commission's Rules should in any case prevent a municipality which is ready, able and otherwise qualified to build and operate a station, while the area's educators are not, from bringing this vitally needed service to the public.

## IX

Had the Commission adopted and applied the general principles set forth above, adequate provision for education would have been achieved. Since it did not, however, and for the further reasons enumerated below in particular cases, I find it necessary in several instances to dissent from the Commission's final Table of Assignments. My objections to specific assignments may be grouped in the following categories:

a. *Proposed VHF reservations have been deleted.* (pars. 431, 588, 611 and 586).

In *Indianapolis* (Indiana), *Kansas City* (Missouri) and *Omaha* (Nebraska), the Commission has improperly deleted proposed VHF reservations and substituted UHF reservations in their place. In *Columbia* (Missouri), a proposed VHF reservation for a "primarily educational center" has been deleted without any substitute reservation provided. I believe, however, that the VHF reservation should have been retained and finalized in every one of these cities.

These deletions have been based upon the lack of local educational demand for VHF reservations and commercial opposition to them. The basic fallacy of a policy predicated upon demand has already been pointed out and is fully applicable here. Reservations, it should be remembered, are primarily set aside for the benefit of the people who will be served by these non-commercial stations. A reserved

channel therefore confers no interest which local educators can refuse, barter or sell. The only right an educator has in a reserved channel is one of use and service subject to Commission approval and its Rules and Regulations. If he is unwilling to exercise this right, no matter his position or influence, the VHF channel should remain reserved in that community for the use of its more enlightened and public spirited citizens and educators.

The public interest should not here be neglected solely because educators now in office refuse to accept or recognize television's opportunity and challenge. Not only may changes in administration bring about a change in the thinking of their institutions, but the passage of time and the example set by other educators using TV, may bring about radical revision even in their own attitudes. They may then be quick, if the channel is gone, to demand its return and cry that the Commission should have guarded them against their own error. We have seen such a cycle in radio and must insure against its repetition in television. The Commission must not adopt the shortsightedness of a few as its own basic policy.

It should be noted here with regard to all allocations that the contest for assignments is now largely confined to the VHF frequencies, and particularly to those cities in which VHF stations are already on the air. Thus, of the 73 cities in the United States in which the Commission had proposed VHF educational assignments, commercial interests in 22 of these cities have objected to the reservations and requested that they be deleted. In fully half of the 26 instances in which a VHF reservation was proposed for cities with presently operating stations, commercial objections were received to such reservations. Yet, at the same time, there was not a single commercial objection seeking to delete specifically proposed UHF reservations, although a total of 127 had been proposed by the Commission.

Without doubt, however, a tight situation such as exists where VHF is now operating is only being delayed in the remainder of the VHF and in the entire UHF, and will develop there with increasing intensity as available TV assignments are taken up. To insure the full and unrestricted opportunity in television that education needs and deserves, the Commission must now stand firm against the immediate claims of commercial expediency seeking deletions from those few VHF channels which have been reserved.

*b. Additional VHF and UHF assignments have been provided*

*without being reserved for educational purposes.*

1. In its Third Notice the Commission set forth the principles for determining allocations to education, which provided in part for a reservation in every city with three or more assignments and a VHF reservation in cities with at least three VHF assignments of which one was still available. The Third Notice scrupulously followed these principles in proposing its assignments and reservations. Yet, in several instances herein the Commission has provided a number of educational assignments which these principles would require to be reserved for education, but in every instance save one the Commission has deviated from the principle, failed to make such reservation and, instead, has assigned the channel for commercial use. It has done so solely on the basis that no educational demand has been manifested for such reservation. This is the case in *Youngstown* (Ohio); *Scranton, Altoona and Harrisburg* (Pennsylvania); *Santa Barbara* (California), and *Bellingham* (Washington) where third assignments have been provided, and in *Lubbock* (Texas) and *Buffalo-Niagara Falls* (New York) where third VHF's have been assigned, the latter by virtue of the combination for assignment purposes of those two cities into one metropolitan area.

The Commission has failed to give any reason why the general preestablished rules respecting educational allocations should not be applied to these additional assignments. How can the Commission consistently distinguish those instances where a city received its assignments under the Third Notice from those where that third assignment, or that third VHF, came to it as the result of the city-by-city hearings? Furthermore, in only a single one of these instances (Buffalo) did the commercial interests requesting the additional assignment refer to or deal with the question of whether this assignment, if made, should be reserved for education as required by the principles of the Third Notice or should be made available to commercial interests. Therefore, in order to achieve a consistent application of these aforementioned principles the Commission should reserve every third assignment and third VHF, above specified, for educational purposes.

2. Similarly the Commission has allocated a first or second VHF channel to several cities, but in no case has this VHF been assigned for educational purposes, although there was clear need for such action and the educators affected have strongly articulated their support of educational assignments. Thus, in *Hartford* (Connecticut), the added VHF assignment, if reserved, could immediately serve as the hub of

a contemplated state-wide educational network. In Bay City (Michigan) *where local educators made a strong showing for a VHF channel*, the Commission disregarded it despite the fact that an additional VHF was assigned to that city. Although that VHF was not the exact one requested by Bay City's educators, it should be noted that the Commission did not find such circumstances to be an obstacle, when, *on its own motion*, it allocated VHF 10 to Altoona (Pennsylvania) although commercial interests there had demanded the assignment of a completely different VHF channel. This example illustrates the pattern of Commission inconsistency; it deviates (in Youngstown, Lubbock, etc.) from principles requiring reservations on the basis that no educational demand has been manifested, and yet in Bay City it adheres to principles restricting reservations even in the face of clear demand for such assignments.

While it is true that the general principles of the Third Notice do not require these additional VHF's to be reserved, I believe that ordinary fairness at least requires consistent Commission action in like situations, whether commercial or educational. In these above-mentioned instances, the entire record so well supports education's need for the VHF channels involved that they should be set aside in every one of these cities.

*c. VHF reservations requested for early educational operations have not been provided.*

The Commission must not only reserve channels for education but it must implement its reservation in a realistically effective manner, reasonably calculated to bring about the actual operation of these channels. In order to achieve large-scale educational use of television, it is clearly imperative that there first be pioneers into the field whose stations will provide a strong stimulus for the entire movement and serve as "pilot plants" for similar operations. The Commission, however, has made practically no allowance for this need and in almost every instance has refused to provide the additional VHF reservations which have been requested for immediate or early educational operations. In so doing it has rejected forceful showings of the public interest requiring such assignments.

The particular facts in each of the following cases further demonstrate the validity of these requests for VHF reservations:

1. *Columbus* (Ohio) (Par. 417 of the Sixth Report)

Ohio State University in Columbus is now ready, willing and

able to make immediate use of VHF 12 in Columbus and it already has on file an application for a construction permit to build on that channel. Ohio State is without question among the leading and most influential institutions in the field of educational broadcasting. Its activities began in 1922 and have continued on a constantly increasing scale to the present time over its own Stations WOSU and WOSU-FM. Its annual broadcasting budget presently exceeds \$150,000.

With a VHF channel, Ohio State could immediately carry its leadership into television and give a needed impetus to the development of this new, specialized medium. The existence of three operating VHF stations in Columbus, however, and the high percentage of VHF set ownership there, near a saturation point of 55%, requires Ohio State, as a practical matter, to secure a VHF channel for its operations. Without a VHF, its operations will be delayed and it becomes a matter of speculation when the school will enter television on a full-time basis.

Undeniably, the shifts in assignments which would be required in order to bring VHF 12 to Columbus present certain difficulties. The Commission, however, should not merely "count the noses" of comparative populations nor make the bare number of channels involved the determinative factor. In this situation, I believe that the proper application of allocations principles and the public interest require the Commission to make this requested assignment of VHF 12 to Columbus for educational purposes.

## 2. *Detroit, (Michigan)* (Par. 479 of the Sixth Report)

The Board of Education of the City of Detroit has requested, by a series of channel shifts, the assignment of a fourth VHF (11) in that city in place of VHF Channel 56 proposed to be reserved there. I believe that the three existing VHF television stations in Detroit, as well as the 600,000 TV sets in the hands of its public, make a VHF reservation necessary if education is not to be placed at an initial handicap in its operations in Detroit. Furthermore, education there has already had extensive and successful experience in actual television programming and is, therefore, uniquely capable of quick expansion into full-time educational operations over its own independent station.

The Commission's actions here and in Columbus reveal striking inconsistency. Rejection of the Ohio State request for a VHF assignment was predicated upon a comparison of the relative populations of Indianapolis, Clarksburg and Huntington as against Columbus and, in addition, the net loss of one VHF channel caused by that counterpro-

posals. While disapproving the use of such a numerical yardstick in this proceeding, I firmly believe that its consistent application would have resulted in a grant of the educational counterproposal for Detroit. The gain of a fourth VHF in Detroit, the fifth largest city in the country with a metropolitan population of 3 million, together with a first VHF for Bay City-Saginaw with its 240,000 population, as requested, would more than compensate in my opinion for the loss of the second VHF proposed in Toledo with its 400,00 population and the first VHF proposed in Flint with its 270,000 population. There would be no net loss in the total number of VHF channels and a substitute UHF channel could be provided for Toledo, which would help the educators there, who otherwise face the unhappy prospect of having the only UHF assignment in that city.

On any basis, therefore, the assignment of a VHF to Detroit for educational purposes is warranted and clearly in the public interest.

3. *Fort Wayne* (Indiana) and *Carbondale* (Illinois)—(Pars. 438 and 518 of the Sixth Report)

Indiana Technical College has requested the assignment and reservation of VHF 5 in *Fort Wayne* for immediate educational operation. Southern Illinois University has requested the assignment and reservation of VHF 10 in *Carbondale* to permit its early initiation of educational TV operations. Both require a VHF channel for additional, substantial reasons: Indiana Technical College, in order to make use of TV equipment (valued at more than \$100,000) donated to it, some of which is usable only in the lower portion of the VHF; Southern Illinois University, in order to bring a needed first VHF service to more than 370,000 people in the southern one-third of the state, a number considerably greater than that which could be reached by a UHF operation. The Commission has denied both requests on the basis that each violated minimum mileage separations established herein and, in addition, has denied the further request of Indiana Technical College for an assignment to be limited to low-power operations in order to prevent objectionable interference.

The Commission's denial of these requested VHF assignments has resulted in the loss, for the time being, of particularly valuable educational licensees who could otherwise have begun early operations. Here, too, a UHF assignment may cause substantial delay and make speculative the time when these schools will enter the medium on a full-scale basis. Here then are particularly glaring examples of what

has resulted from the Commission's mistake in not recognizing education as a separate and distinct service, its omission of a high-ranking educational priority in the allocations, and its failure to construct an allocations plan and a Table of Assignments reasonably designed to meet these major needs in educational television. These faults are responsible for the absence of educational VHF assignments in Fort Wayne and Carbondale and I believe the Table of Assignments to be in error in not providing them. Had proper principles been established in this proceeding, these assignments would have been granted as being in strict conformity with them, rather than, as they have been forced to appear here, counterproposals seeking operations in violation of those general principles provided herein.

## X

The Commission, in making an allocations plan, is forced to act in an area filled with imponderables and unknowns. It ventures into the future without assurance or expectation of absolute certainty. It is only reasonable to assume, therefore, that some misjudgments and errors will be made in the balancing and the determination of the many conflicting factors involved, all of which are subject to future change. If the Commission must err, however, it should take care to do so on the side of the public interest.

Elsewhere in this Report the Commission refers often to the "safety factor" requiring particular attention on its part not to unduly circumscribe future developments. Nowhere is such margin for error more necessary than here in the case of educational reservations where a denial is, for all practical purposes, permanent and irremediable. It would be far better therefore, since it must choose an alternative, for the Commission to reserve too many channels than for it to reserve too few. It is the latter alternative which involves the cost too great to hazard.

## XI

Education in a democracy is not a luxury; it is an imperative. The strengthening and expansion of our educational system is a most urgent requirement of our national policy. Nothing that could be done to improve that educational system, however, can approach the force and impact of television.

Educational use of television on an extensive scale is not an impractical dream or a noble hope; rather it stands on the threshold

of realization. Given sufficient recognition and encouragement, its substantial fulfillment could be achieved in the relatively near future. For those reasons, and in order to keep faith with its statutory responsibilities, the Commission should provide maximum reservations to preserve in full this once-in-a-lifetime chance for both television and education. I deeply regret that this has not been done in these proceedings.

The channels for education provided herein, however incomplete, do offer an opportunity which the American people should seize upon as soon as possible and which they cannot afford to let slip away by default. They offer, too, a challenge that must be accepted and met by every school, every teacher, parent, public official, technician and public-spirited person and organization in each community or concerned with each community herein affected. This priceless opportunity for public welfare is one that must carefully be guided and guarded by all in order to achieve the maximum benefits of which it is capable. Without doubt, there are sizeable obstacles, not the least of which is the opposition of selfish interests, that must be overcome before educational stations in large numbers are built and put into operation. In view, however, of the enormous public benefits offered by educational-TV, and its steadily growing support, I firmly believe that with earnest efforts on all our parts these obstacles will be overcome and that educational television will prevail and grow and, in time, exceeding our greatest expectations, will flourish as an integral part of our educational and broadcasting systems.

## APPENDIX B

Estimated Costs of Construction and Operation of Television Stations Proposed by Board of Regents of the University of the State of New York. (Exhibit X. Evidence in Support of Comments of the Board of Regents of the University of the State of New York before the FCC, September 4, 1951.)

### CONSTRUCTION

#### *a. Equipment common to all stations except Malone Transmitting Facilities*

Transmitter, 10-12 kilowatt, including two (2) sets of tubes, operating control unit and dummy antenna load	\$ 153,550.00
---	---------------

Input and Monitoring equipment, including Video and audio frequency monitors, Video demodulator, Audio modulation monitor, Stabilizing amplifier, Distribution amplifier, Limiting amplifier, Monitor amplifier and speaker, Video and audio patching, Cabinet racks and accessories	9,346.00
--	----------

Antenna, including deicing equipment (power gain of 25)	23,050.00
---	-----------

Transmission line, 600 ft. of 6-½ inch, including dry air equipment and tower hangers (efficiency 78-80 percent)	14,050.00
--	-----------

Tower, self-supporting, 500 ft. above base, including lighting and erection	42,500.00
---	-----------

Installation including transmission line, AC power and equipment wiring	10,000.00
---	-----------

Total, Transmitting Facilities	<u>\$252,496.00</u>
--------------------------------	---------------------

### *Programming Facilities*

Video control equipment, including Synchronizing generator, Switching and mixing units, Monitoring units, Stabilizing amplifier, Distribution amplifier, Video patching, Cabinet racks, consoles and accessories 20,468.00

Film and Projection equipment, including Two film camera chains with control units, monitoring, equipment racks wired, pedestals, cables and plugs, Two 16 mm projectors, Still projector, Mirror multiplexer, Flying spot scanner 31,793.00

Studio and Remote camera equipment, including Two portable image orthicon camera chains, Master monitor, Camera dollies, cables and plugs, STL radio relay equipment 61,900.00

Audio and Intercom equipment, including Audio control and switching, Audio patching, Monitor speaker, Turntables, Microphones, mike stands and boom, Intercom and cue units, Cables, receptacles and plugs, Portable amplifier for remote use 9,457.00

Installation, including AC power and equipment wiring 10,000.00

---

Total, Programming Facilities 133,618.00

Equipment for one station at current prices 386,114.00

Less 10% discount 347,503.00

### *b. Additional Equipment at New York*

Facilities for kinescope recording on film for distribution to other stations 45,000.00

Pool of five (5) portable image orthicon cameras, each with control equipment, power supply and accessories, for use when and where needed at different station locations in the state 78,500.00

---

Total 123,500.00

*Additional Equipment at New York (continued)*

Less 10% discount	111,150.00
<i>c. Equipment at Malone</i>	
Transmitting Facilities, same as above	252,496.00
Programming Facilities	
Video control equipment	8,000.00
Film and projection equipment	31,793.00
Audio equipment	4,000.00
Installation	3,000.00
Total	46,793.00
Total cost of equipment	299,289.00
Less 10% discount	269,360.00
<i>d. Recapitulation</i>	
1. Buffalo, Rochester, Syracuse, Utica-Rome, Albany-Schenectady-Troy, Ithaca, Binghamton and Poughkeepsie, 8 x 347,503	2,780,024.00
2. New York 2 x 347,503	695,006.00
Additional equipment	111,150.00
Total	806,156.00
3. Malone	269,360.00
Total equipment	3,855,540.00

TECHNICAL OPERATION

*a. Costs common to all stations except Malone*

*Transmitting Facilities*

AC power @ 1.5¢ per kilowatt-hour	9,357.00
Tubes @ \$200.00 per 100 hours use	11,000.00
Maintenance, parts and supplies, @ \$300.00 per 1000 hours use of equipment	1,650.00

*Personnel:*

Station engineer, Assistant station engineer, Three transmitter engineers, Porter-Janitor	26,620.00
Total	48,627.00

### *Programming Facilities*

AC power @ 1.5¢ per kilowatt-hour	1,237.50
Tubes @ \$500.00 per 100 hours use, including (2) image orthicon tubes used 50% as much time as other equipment	27,500.00
Maintenance, parts and supplies @ \$600.00 per 1000 hours use of equipment	3,300.00
Rental for video and audio circuits from studio to transmitter based on average distance of 4 miles	6,381.00

#### **Personnel:**

Studio engineer, Assistant studio engineer, Three control technicians, Three film technicians, and Four technicians to be assigned when and where needed on studio control, cameras, remotes, maintenance, etc.

	49,400.00
Total	<hr/> 87,818.50

### *Administration*

Station manager, Secretary	10,000.00
Annual cost for one station	146,455.00

#### **b. Malone**

Transmitting Facilities, same as above	48,627.00
--	-----------

### **Programming Facilities**

AC power @ 1.5¢ per kilowatt hours	200.00
Tubes @ \$10 per 100 hours use	550.00
Maintenance at \$.50 per 1000 hours use	27.50
Rental for video and audio circuits	6,381.00
Personnel: 3 film technicians	11,700.00
Total	<hr/> 18,858.50
Administration	10,000.00
Total annual cost	77,485.50

#### **c. Recapitulation**

1. Annual cost of technical operation of all stations except Malone, 10 x 146,445.50	1,464,455.00
--	--------------

2. Annual cost of technical operation at Malone	77,485.50
3. Annual cost for inter-city network facilities to connect all (11) stations with both video and audio channels, as estimated by New York Telephone Company	732,000.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,273,940.50</b>

### *Notes*

1. Micro-wave equipment for inter-city network connections between all (11) stations may be considered in lieu of the \$732,000.00 annual rental estimated by the New York Telephone Company. Estimates obtained indicate:

#### *Capital Costs*

39 Inter-city relays	838,500.00
39 Towers (240 ft.) installed	175,500.00
Installation including building, creating access to building, etc.	780,000.00
Installation of power lines	71,280.00
<b>Total Capital Costs</b>	<b>1,865,280.00</b>

#### *Annual Operating Costs*

AC power	11,700.00
Tubes	64,350.00
Maintenance	85,800.00
	<b>161,850.00</b>

2. In connection with programming costs, it is estimated that kinescope recording on film will cost approximately \$75 for the first print of a half-hour program and \$36 for each additional print up to 10 prints.

## APPENDIX C

### THE LOW STATE OF TV

---

#### Television Is Trading Future Greatness For Synthetic Popularity Ratings

---

By Jack Gould

(This article appeared Oct. 19, 1952 and is reprinted here with permission of The New York Times Sunday Department and Jack Gould.)

Let's face it: television is getting pretty bad. The high hopes for video which were held by so many are vanishing before our eyes. The medium is heading hell-bent for the rut of innocuity, mediocrity and sameness that made a drab if blatant jukebox of radio. The success of TV is proving a hollow and disheartening jest: television apparently can't stand prosperity.

Remember the proud words, many of them emanating from this corner, of how television represented a vital new form of electronic theatre that augured an exciting and challenging new cultural era? Or how the imperishable wonders of a vibrant and articulate stage would be spread to the far corners of the land?

Look at the television giant this season. Morning, noon and night the channels are cluttered with eye-wearying monstrosities called "films-for-television," half-hour aberrations that in story and acting would make an erstwhile Hollywood producer of "B" pictures shake his head in dismay. Is this the destiny of television: a cut-rate nickel-odeon?

Or look what's happening in what may go down as the "I-Love-Lucy" era of television. Miss Lucille Ball and Desi Arnaz came up with a legitimate and true hit. Presto! The minions of TV take their cue. Let's all do situation comedy—absurd and incredible little charades that would be hooted off the stage of the high school auditorium. Hold high the mask of make-believe? Put out the hambone!

Whither the drama? Where is the Tony Miner that proudly and unafraid gave TV a "Julius Caesar" to remember? What of the Celanese Theatre that had the dignity to scorn the censor's blue pencil? In their stead largely are elongated whodunits and soap operas that are embellished with production trickiness and glamour to obscure the vacuum that lies underneath.

What of the endless procession of crime thrillers that supinely worship at the throne of "action" as a substitute for characterization and suspense? And of the panel shows with the same faces appearing over and over again with monotonous regularity? They are ever with us.

And the children's programs? Is there no surcease from the nauseating trifles whereon the younger generation sing the praises of cereals and candy bars? Are these programs to be the sole measure of the child's inheritance of the riches of the library and the treasures of the arts? The death of television's Mr. I. Magination is a symbol, not a statistic.

Television must take heed. It is blindly and short-sightedly selling its ultimate greatness for a batch of synthetic popularity ratings that are boring into TV's foundations like termites. It is caught on the old radio treadmill of repetition and imitation in the wan and futile hope that it need not face up to the realities that lie ahead.

### *Slow Paralysis*

Sponsors and broadcasters fool only themselves—not their audiences nor their customers—if they think they can mold television into a pattern that is risk-proof and sure, as they are trying to do now. Their only security and their only insurance for the days ahead lies in bold recognition that, if television is to retain its vigor as an advertising form, they themselves must live excitingly.

Gentlemen, wake up! Out with artiness and the academic approach; let's talk business!

What's happening to television is a slow paralysis of its living organs. Now that the medium is fully accepted, the gentlemen who are paying the bills have decided to be content with the handful of program formulas that bring predictable results. They are being suckers for the bromidic contention that the American public can be divided up into several big chunks. Then just give 'em what they want, goes the cry.

Any industrialist who followed that line of archaic reasoning knows in his own heart he soon would be booted out of office by his board of directors or stockholders. How on earth did the public know it wanted cellophane? Or frozen orange juice? Or lifesaving penicillin at the price of a box of chocolates? They didn't have the foggiest concept of such things. It is the research, the imagination, and the willing-

ness to take risks that made American industry what it is today and the source of uncountable blessings for a fuller and more enjoyable living.

This analogy holds true for television. To be content with the "products" of television as they stand now, merely because their acceptance by the public is beyond doubt, is to follow the most perilous course open to broadcasters and sponsors. It can only lead to one end: a constant shrinkage of the base upon which the whole medium rests.

If only in economic self-defense the sponsors and broadcasters must now embark on a program of research and experimentation in television programming. This goal is not altruistic or intellectual; it is eminently practical. By constantly broadening and stimulating the public taste, the sponsors are widening the billboards upon which in future years they can paste their advertisements. If they are to use the arts for legitimate commercial ends, common sense dictates that they diversify those arts just as they diversify the output of their factories.

How is this to be done, asks the business man? Let's ask the business man a question: how does he meet such problems in his own business? Why does he have lawyers, engineers, chemists, foremen, personnel specialists?

In television the answer is the same. There are writers, actors, directors and producers who have devoted a lifetime to learning their specialized crafts. For heaven's sake let them do their jobs as they know they should be done.

Give the writers the chance to write what is in their hearts and consciences and give them the chance to say it in their own way. What do writers know of the problems of vice-presidents in charge of sales; what do vice-presidents in charge of sales know of the problems of writers?

Bring on the plays that have something to say and are not afraid to take a stand. Give the directors and producers the chance to try out those ideas that are departures from the norm. Encourage the exploration of ballet, opera, education, concerts, the lecture stage, religion, Restoration comedy, the classic. If the sponsor of every program on the air allowed a director to do just one experiment a year of his own choosing, think of what it would mean for the creative processes of television.

The leaders of broadcasting—those who own stations and those who directly influence its course by the programs they choose to spon-

sor—owe it not only to themselves but to the public as well to search their consciences.

Can they honestly maintain that our competitive free enterprise is so helpless, so unimaginative and so lacking in daring that the measure of success in television must be the popularity of mediocrity not of excellence? They can give the answer only one way: on the screens of 19,000,000 receivers.











